

THE  
EVANGELICAL  
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LXXIX.

JULY, 1869.

ARTICLE I.

THE SACRAMENTAL PRESENCE.

By Rev. CYRUS THOMAS, De Soto, Ill.

We have no other apology to offer for entering into the contest concerning the presence of our Lord's body in the Eucharist, than our desire to contribute our mite in defense of what we conceive to be *truth*. While we claim this as our motive, we concede the same to those whose views we shall oppose. We have no intention of attempting a survey of the broad field over which this controversy has spread, but shall strive to confine ourselves to the points raised by Dr. Krauth, in his articles in the January and July numbers 1867, of the *Evangelical Quarterly Review*. Not because he, as an individual, has placed them on record; nor as the expressions of an individual opinion; nor because they are new; but for the reason that in the form there expressed, they directly concern the Lutheran Church in America. And another reason for selecting these articles and limiting ourselves to them, is, that by confining ourselves, as far as possible, to the words of a cotemporaneous leader in the ranks of that party, we may, if possible, avoid rendering ourselves obnoxious to

the charge of misrepresentation and misconception, in regard to their opinions.

If Dr. Krauth correctly sets forth (as we suppose he does,) the *present* status of this doctrine, in the ranks of its advocates, we admit that very much that has been said against it, has fallen wide of the mark.

In order to avoid circumlocution, we shall make use of Dr. Krauth's name in our article, as the representative of that part of the Lutheran Church in America, which advocates the doctrine of the "Sacramental Presence."

We claim this right, because it is an article of faith published to the world by that body to which the Dr. belongs, and of which he is a prominent member, that "Confessions \* \* must be accepted in every statement of doctrine, \* \* and those who subscribe them must, not only agree to use them in the same words, but use and understand those words in one and the same sense."

#### *The Point in Dispute.*

Dr. Krauth maintains that "the body and blood of Christ are truly present in the Lord's Supper." "That apart from all qualities in the recipient, the presence of Christ's humanity in the Lord's Supper, is a positive reality." Also, that this presence is, "after another mode, supernatural, illocal, incomprehensible, and yet real." "A presence not ideal or feigned, but most true; not fleshy, but spiritual; not after the manner of this earth, but of the unseen world; not natural, but supernatural." While we maintain, "That there is no presence of the glorified human body of the Saviour, either substantial or influential, (local or illocal,) in the Eucharist; yet, that whilst the bread and wine are merely symbolic representations of the Saviour's absent body, by which we are reminded of his sufferings, there is a peculiar and special spiritual blessing bestowed by the divine Saviour on all worthy communicants."\*

Hence, our dispute with Dr. Krauth, is as to the *fact* of the presence of our Lord's body in the Supper. It is the "essence" of the doctrine that divides us. He maintains it is present, we deny it. Thus far, we suppose, the Dr. will agree with us, in stating the difference between our positions. But when we descend to a definition or explanation of the terms used by the Confession in stating this

---

\* See Dr. Schmucker's *Pop. Theol.* 252.

doctrine, the boundary lines of the territory between us no longer stand out so boldly and distinctly. When we ask them to give us a statement of what they understand by the terms "true body," "under the form of bread," "in the Lord's Supper," &c.; or on our own part attempt to base an argument on these terms, according to their usual signification; divergence and confusion at once ensue. The one side claiming its views have been misunderstood; the other claiming it has followed the usual and correct meaning of the terms employed.

Without attempting to prove each statement here made, we will illustrate by one or two examples from the Dr's. articles.

First, in regard to the meaning of the term "true body." That in itself its presence is determinate. That it is not present by extension or locality, but after a manner wholly incomprehensible to us, but yet, "if there be degrees of reality, more real than the local." Thus, if we judge of *what* is present by the manner of presence, destroying every attribute that we are acquainted with, as belonging to the human body.

Second, in regard to "in the Lord's Supper," although claiming that the Lord's body is present and received *in* the Lord's Supper; yet denying that it has any local presence *in, with, or under* the bread. But that "the sphere of the reality of the sacramental mystery is not of this world."

In reference to the first, we find him drawing distinctions upon very slight differences.

In the July number, (p. 399,) he quotes the language of Dr. Gerhart, and comments on it as follows:

"Dr. Gerhart goes on to say, that the Lutheran Church holds that 'communicants, unbelievers as well as believers, partake of the human nature of Christ, with the mouth.' We have looked a little into Lutheran theology, and must confess that the expression 'partaking of the *human nature* of Christ with the mouth,' is one which we never met, and which is to us incomprehensible."<sup>\*\*</sup>

Now what can Dr. Krauth intend by this language, unless it be to deny the correctness of Dr. Gerhart's statement? No other inference can be drawn from it. Nor does his waiver afterwards, and reference to the Lutheran

---

\* The italics are Dr. Krauth's

Church, as a whole, in regard to the words "with the mouth," destroy the intended force of his objection in the language quoted. From his italics we infer the offensive words are "human nature," used in the connection Dr. Gerhart has placed them.

That Dr. Krauth would condescend to a criticism of the verbal arrangement of the sentence, with no other more serious objection lying behind it, we cannot believe. And his own words contradict this idea, for he says, the expression is to him incomprehensible. Hence, his objection is a substantial one, and one that concerns his own opinion. And, yet, there is not one single thought, or even shade of meaning conveyed in that sentence, as a whole, or in its parts, but what Dr. Krauth holds and advocates, unless he rejects the Formula of Concord. But, as we have nothing to do with Dr. Gerhart's defence, we shall only examine this position, so far as necessary to the object we have in view.

Before he gets through that section of his article, he admits the oral reception of the body of Christ. Moreover, the language of the Formula (which we must defend,) is explicit. "The other mode of partaking of the body of Christ is oral or sacramental, when in the Lord's Supper, the *true, essential body and blood* of Christ are received and *partaken of orally*."

Between this and the expression used by Dr. Gerhart, to which Dr. Krauth so seriously objects, there is but one point at which a difference could even be claimed; and that is between "body and blood" and "human nature." Yet, in at least a dozen places in the articles, we have quoted, he uses the words "*human nature*" of Christ, or "*humanity*" of Christ, to designate that which is present in the Eucharist; and, also, as equivalent to body and blood. For instance, (on p. 425, July,) "But as the communion is not based upon something ideal, but upon a supernatural verity, upon a presence spiritual, heavenly and incomprehensible in its manner, yet most true, a presence of the *human nature* of Christ—as a mystery of this presence has its heart not in us, but in the Incarnate Mediator, we believe that alike to those who receive the Supper in faith, and to those who receive it in unbelief, the object sacramentally received is the same." Here he uses "*human nature of Christ*," to designate that which is sacramentally (which the Formula explains by orally) received at the Lord's Supper.

Again, (p. 427,) "Our theologians when they speak of a reception by the mouth, mean no more than this—that he that receives the bread and wine by the mouth naturally, thereby, as by an organ, *receives the humanity of Christ sacramentally and supernaturally.*"

The real difficulty here with Dr. Krauth, is to find a form of words that will convey what he understands by the "body of Christ." But we are inclined to think the origin of this difficulty lies in the doctrine itself.

These illustrations are sufficient to show that, as we descend to the sub-divisions of the subject, the points of divergence increase.

Before leaving this point, we desire to compare Dr. Krauth's explanation of this oral reception, with what Dr. Luther says on the same subject.

The former defines as follows: "When the Formula and our theologians speak of a reception by the mouth, they speak as we may of the reception of the Holy Spirit, in, with, and under the preached Word, by the ear." And quoting Gerhart, "This sacramental eating is said to be spiritual, because the body of Christ is not eaten naturally, and because the mode of eating, like the presence itself, is neither natural, carnal, physical, nor local, but supernatural, divine, mystical, heavenly and spiritual."

We acknowledge that we experience some difficulty in understanding what kind of eating, with the natural mouth, that can be, which is neither natural, carnal, physical nor local, but is supernatural, divine, mystical, heavenly and spiritual.

The Formula asserts that, "The proper meaning of said Augsburg Confession, cannot be drawn from any other man's writing, more accurately and certainly, than from the didactic and polemic writings of Dr. Luther." And, Dr. Krauth, as a member of the General Council declares, that "In thus formally accepting and acknowledging the unaltered Augsburg Confession, we declare our conviction, that the other Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, inasmuch as *they set forth none other than its system of doctrine and articles of faith, are of necessity pure and scriptural.* Pre-eminent among such accordant, pure and scriptural statements of doctrine \* \* are these; the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, the Catechisms of Luther, and the *Formula of Concord.*"

Let us then turn to Luther's writings and see what he says on the subject of the oral reception, and compare it with the explanation given by Dr. Krauth.

"So this text is now clear, that the body of Christ is broken, distributed, and eaten at the table, like other bread, though under the form of bread, or in the bread."<sup>\*</sup>

"Hence the Enthusiasts have acted improperly, as well as the Glossary on the Ecclesiastical Law, where they censure Pope Nicolas for forcing Berenger to this Confession, namely: compelling him to say, that he ground and pressed with his teeth, the real body of Christ. Would to God, that all the Popes were constrained to speak in a manner so becoming a Christian, as this Pope constrained Berenger to speak. For, it is indeed, the design of God, that whoever takes and eats this bread, shall take and eat the real body of Christ, and not mere bread only, as Wickliff teaches; for this bread is the body of Christ, just as the dove was the Holy Ghost, and the flame the angel."

"Thus, also, it is correct to say, whenever any one takes the bread, that he takes the body of Christ; when he eats the bread, he eats the body; when he presses this bread with his teeth and tongue, that he presses the body of Christ with his teeth and tongue; and ever true will it remain, however, that no one beholds, handles, eats or masticates the body of Christ, in that visible manner, in which one eats or masticates other flesh."<sup>†</sup>

In these words Luther certainly advocates a real and substantial oral reception of the Lord's body in the Eucharist. It is true, he does not hold, that it is in the visible manner in which other flesh is masticated; yet, it is a true eating in that sense, in which it is correct to say the teeth and tongue press the body of Christ. The reader can compare this explanation with that of Dr. Krauth's, and draw his own conclusion in regard to their agreement with each other.

#### *The Arguments used to Maintain the Doctrine.*

Beginning with the omnipresence of the Divine nature—which must be admitted—he assumes that the undivided totality of the Divine substance, is in each part of the universe at the same time. That there is no more of God in

<sup>\*</sup> Diss. on the Lord's Supper, Sec. 434.

<sup>†</sup> Ib. 347—8.

the whole universe, than in each point of it; and, yet, without motion, extension or multiplication of presences. Then, taking it as granted, that this infinite Spirit has taken to itself a human nature as an inseparable element of its person, he claims as an inevitable result, that where the divine is, the human must be. That as the lowest element of a personal union is the co-presence of the parts; therefore, if there is a place where the human nature of Christ is not united with the second person of the Trinity, then there is a place where the second person is not incarnate; and if not incarnate in one place, then in none: Then as the Divine nature is admitted to be present in the Lord's Supper, it must follow, as an inevitable conclusion, that the Lord's human nature is there also.

If each step of this process of reasoning, except the last, were established, we would be compelled to admit that it would necessarily follow.

*Our Exceptions to this Reasoning.*

Our first objection is to basing an argument on the assumption of that which he confesses lies within the region of incomprehensibility. I say "assumption," for to assert that the *undivided totality* of the *substance* of God, is in each part of the universe; *all in heaven, and all on earth*, all on earth without ceasing in any measure to be all in heaven; without motion, extension, expansion, division or multiplication of presences, is an assumption. It is assuming that which is not known, not demonstrated, or susceptible of demonstration. Though many theologians assent to it, and their opinions are worthy of regard, yet it is but assumed. Is God omnipresent? Certainly he is. I believe this as firmly as Dr. Krauth, or any one else. And while I believe the human mind may grasp the single idea of omnipresence in a *qualitative* sense, yet I believe with him, that the *how* is an "inscrutable mystery." But he in one breath says, it is an "inscrutable mystery," "utterly incomprehensible to us," and in the next, tells us, it is all in heaven and all on earth at the same time, without motion, extension, expansion, division or multiplication of presences. If it is *utterly* incomprehensible, how does he know it is not by emanation, diffusion, or *expansion*? How does he know there is as much of God in one place as another? How does he comprehend it sufficiently to know that it is without motion, extension or multipresence?

Where has Revelation asserted this fact? Had it done so, then the *how* would not have been utterly incomprehensible. These are negative definitions; hence, Dr. Krauth's expression is too broad, or his definitions and limitations are gratuitous. Yet there are foundation stones, on which to build a "fundamental doctrine."

Our second exception is to his asking it to be granted "that this infinite Spirit, (the divine Logos,) has taken to itself a human nature, as an inseparable element of *its own person*;" and, at the same time, denying that this humanity "is confounded with the divinity." Had he asked that it be granted, that by the incarnation, the human nature had become a real and necessary element or constituent of the "Unio,"—the person, Christ—we would have no controversy with him here. But to assert that the Logos has taken to itself a human nature, to be an inseparable element and constituent of *its own person*, appears, to our mind, so much like the blending of the natures, or absorption of the human by the divine, that we cannot accept it.

Our third exception is, that while the Dr. claims that the divine nature has a presence without extension, expansion or locality; and that it renders the human nature present, also, without extension, expansion or locality; yet he assumes this locality in the chief step of his reasoning. For his argument is, "If there be *a place* where the human nature of Christ is not united with the second person of the Trinity, then there is a place where the second person of the Trinity is not incarnate. If this is granted, then the whole second person of the Trinity is unincarnate." If locality has nothing to do with this mode of presence, how can the Dr. base an argument upon the relation the union of the natures bears to a given place? Grant what he claims, and it at once proves a local presence, a presence within a given boundary. Thus, I select a given place, (and place must have locality) and assert the Lord's human nature is not present there: Dr. Krauth asserts it is, for the reason quoted—I then admit it is. What have I admitted? That the human nature of Christ is present in a given space. How then will he free this from the idea of locality, unless he attaches a peculiar and unusual meaning to the term "locality." If he does this, the effect of his answer to the charge of the opposition is destroyed, in regard to local presence. A presence at all points without extension, mo-

tion, multiplication or locality, is something entirely beyond the grasp of the human mind; and as Dr. Krauth, himself, places it there, he should not attempt to build an argument on that, which contradicts his own position.

Again, if I assert that the divinity only is in a given place, he will deny it. Why? Can it be for any other reason, than that there comes before his mind the idea of a contradiction of the presence of one nature to a less extent than the other? If this is not the force of his argument, where does it lie? Separate wholly from the argument the idea of extension and locality, and does it prove anything? This, then, is assuming, as a basis for his reasoning, that which he has denied. If this link of his argument is broken, the whole doctrine, so far as his process of reasoning is concerned, falls to the ground.

*Our Objections to the Doctrine, as exhibited in Dr. Krauth's Articles.*

Our first objection, is the constant danger its advocates are in, of falling into Monophysitism, by the side of which their doctrine runs so closely, that it is extremely difficult to distinguish the separating line.

As has been before intimated, the force of their principal arguments seems to depend upon the idea of a commingling of essences in the "Unio," or the absorption of the human by the divine. Although this is expressly denied, yet the language they use, leans strongly in that direction, as will be seen from the language of Dr. Krauth, we have already quoted. And the repeated efforts of the Formula, and the advocates of the Sacramental Presence, to disengage themselves from this idea of a commixture of essences, indicates that they feel their near approach to it, and the extreme tenuity of the line separating them from it. And in this struggle to keep themselves from sliding into Monophysitism, they run into other difficulties equally serious.

While they hold a communication of attributes, they reject the idea of a communication of the essences. Hence, if through the "Unio personalis," divine attributes are communicated, and yet no communication of essence takes place, the attributes will be severed from the divine essence, which is inconsistent with the divine nature. The Dr. asserts, that whatever the divine has, the human has through

the divine. The formula seems to waver between the two positions, now leaning toward the one, now toward the other. As Dorner has truly remarked: "Assiling Monophysitism in a tone implying that the *communicatio idiomatum* was not deemed to involve a communication of the essential elements of the two natures, or their substance: whilst, on the other hand, when the object is to show how much the *communicatio idiomatum* does for the unity, the Formula warns us against supposing that the essential features of the two natures remain foreign to each other, and incommunicable."

Another result of this doctrine, as set forth by the Dr. is, that notwithstanding the *communicatio idiomatum*, the humanity appears to have gained nothing by the union. For of itself its presence is local and determinate, and its claimed omnipresence is only the act of the divine nature, the human remaining passive. Consequently, the humanity is still, "no more than the organ of a special revelation of Diety." "For, unless, the *persona* of the Logos becomes the property of the human nature, and if the person of the Word merely has, and bears a concrete human nature, then humanity is a mere *organon*, and all that deity has attained is a theophany." A passive omnipresence, does not elevate the idea of the incarnation, or indicate any reception on the part of the human nature; it leaves the *persona* with the Logos; and the humanity but an inactive appendage, so far as omnipresence is concerned.

Another objection that we would urge to the doctrine of the presence, as stated by Dr. Krauth, is that it is not compatible with the nature and attributes of Christ.

The divine nature of Christ possesses all the attributes of divinity, including, as a matter of course, omnipresence and omniscience. And, that these attributes are necessary and essential elements of the divine nature, not separable from the divine essence, will be admitted. The Dr.'s own language clearly implies this, notwithstanding the difficulty his doctrine has to contend with, on this point, before alluded to. We cannot be required to harmonize the incompatibles in their system.

"The divine attributes are not to be regarded as an external possession; they are all essential, for in God there is nothing accidental; nay, more, they constitute the es-

---

\* Per. Ch. II. 2. 217.

sence of God, and in their unity are simply the living God himself, who is to be conceived as *actus purissimus*."

"The prevailing opinion, therefore, that the Lutheran doctrine of the *Communicatio idiomatum* is connected with the notion of the separability of the divine attributes from the divine essence, is erroneous. But, in that case, the communication of the divine essence, must also be taught."\*

If, then, by virtue of the "*Unio personalis*" omnipresence is communicated to the humanity, through the divinity; its omnipresence, of necessity, becomes an essential element of his being. In fact, this is one of the pillars on which the Dr. builds. "Where the divine is, the human *must be*." "An *inseparable element*," of the infinite Spirit. And, here he is with Luther. If omnipresence is an essential element of divine existence, it is not then a consequence of will, or divine potency, but a necessity. Hence, it follows, that the omnipresence of the body, (be the mode what it may,) is, also, a divine necessity, not a product of the will. Therefore, the qualifying clause, "Where Christ will," not only loses its force, but stands in opposition to the *Communicatio idiomatum*.

This difficulty was seen and felt not long after the publication of the *Formula Concordiae*. In 1589, the Suabians published a work against the Helmstädtēr theologians, in which they "seek to show that the old doctrine of Brentz, is the genuine meaning of the Formula; by explaining the concession contained in it to Chemnitz—*quando et quomodo voluerit*—not as antagonistic to the absolute omnipresence of the humanity, but as referring solely to the *modus* thereof."†

According to the premises laid down by Dr. Krauth—that where the divine is, the human *must be*—if Christ wills that his human nature shall not be present at a given point, this withdraws the divine presence from that point, and He ceases to be omnipresent; which contradicts the Dr's own position. It would, also, imply a voluntary limitation of divine omniscience, which involves a contradiction. And to will that the human nature should not be at a given place, according to the Dr's reasoning, would render the Logos unincarnate at that place, and consequently wholly unincarnate. What, then, is the force of

\* Dorn. II. 2 : 233.

† Dorn. Per. Ch. D 2. V 2. 269.

the expression, "Where Christ will?" That he has power to manifest Himself at one time and place, in a manner different from that in which his divine nature is ordinarily omnipresent, we are willing to admit. But when this is claimed for any given time or place, (for manifestations to humanity must have time and place,) the *fact* must be established, before an argument can be built on it, worthy of consideration.

Granting the power of our Lord to render His body present in the Eucharist, in each of Luther's modes, does not prove that He does render it present in either of them. Hence, divine potency, is an unnecessary factor in the argument. Nor is the doctrine of the presence, as argued by Dr. Krauth, based upon special manifestations, but upon a law arising out of the "*Unio hypostatica*." All the arguments adduced for it, proceed on this hypothesis.

The "Another mode," rendered so emphatic in Dr. Krauth's Article, (January,) is not there claimed to be, or spoken of, as a special manifestation; but is simply placed in contrast with that mode in which our Lord's body is said to be present, "after its own intrinsic manner," "determinate," and not on earth." And it is to the proof of this position that the Dr. has directed his arguments.

And the result at which he claims he arrives is, that where the divine is, the human must be; hence, as a necessary consequence the Lord's Supper.

But, if this is so, why give this presence the name of "Sacramental presence?" It is a misnomer, for it is, according to their own method of demonstration, in no peculiar sense a Sacramental presence. Let it be remembered, that the argument presented to establish the position is, that the lowest element of personal union is the co-presence of the parts, hence, as the divine is omnipresent, the human must, also, be omnipresent through the divine; wherever the latter is, the former must also be. Luther says, "Everything is full through and through of Christ, even according to his humanity." "Externally to this man, there is no God." As this is the argument to prove the presence of our Lord's body in the Eucharist, if it establishes this, it establishes more; that it is a law of his being, resulting from his hypostatical union; and not a presence peculiar to the Eucharist. Therefore, the name Sacramental presence, is a misnomer, and, unless guarded, conveys (if any,) a wrong meaning.

And, if their arguments prove anything, they prove a general law, that makes the body of Christ present at all times and places, wheresoever his divinity is. And, as this is *all* present, at all times in all places, so, likewise, the "whole Christ," (human and divine,) must be present at all times in all places, (*non abstante* the "*quando et quando voluerit.*") Everything must be, as Luther says, full through and through of Him, even according to his humanity. Therefore, when at tea, having given thanks, we take bread, break and eat it, we are as truly and really eating the broken body of our Lord, as when at the Eucharist. For faith they claim, is not a necessary factor.

It is true, the answer may be returned: "You believe in the spiritual presence in the Eucharist? You believe that Christ is also spiritually omnipresent, hence, in everything, at all times? Is not your usual meal, then, to you as much a sacrament as the Eucharist?

The cases might be considered parallel, if we looked to the presence itself, as the peculiar blessing received at the Lord's Supper. And, if the pertinency of the answer should be admitted, it would apply as much to them, as others. But, in addition to this, they also believe in the presence of the natural body of Christ, and to this, they look as the great and peculiar blessing of this Sacrament.

"Now there are two modes of partaking of the flesh of Christ; the one is spiritual \* \* and this spiritual eating is useful and salutary. \* \* But this spiritual eating is nothing else but faith. \* \* The other mode is oral or sacramental, when in the Lord's Supper, the true, essential body and blood of Christ are received and partaken orally, by all who eat and drink the consecrated bread and wine, in this holy sacrament. Believers receive the body and blood of Christ as a *sure pledge and confirmation that their sins are certainly remitted, and that Christ dwells and is efficacious in them.*"\*

The parts of this last sentence may be consistent with each other, yet, as a whole, it has a strange ring about it. That believers who have Christ dwelling in them, should eat his body orally, as a proof and pledge of this fact, has a singular sound.

Luther says,† "But our wise spirits, who cry out vociferously, 'How can bread and wine forgive sins or strength-

\* Form. Con. See Bk. Con. 673.

† Lar. Cat. 534.

en faith, pervert our meaning with their strange erudition and wisdom, when, at the same time, they hear and know that we do not say this of bread and wine—as bread in itself is bread—but of such bread and wine, as are the body and blood of Christ, and *such as are connected with the words*; *this, and no other, I say, is the treasure, indeed, through which this forgiveness of sins is obtained.*"

Therefore, while we hold that the inference, we have drawn above, is applicable to those advocating this doctrine; on the other hand, we maintain that it will not apply with equal force to those rejecting it. Hear the Dr's own words: "On any other theory, the Christian on earth, has no more a personal Christ with him, than the Patriarchs had; the New Dispensation, has made no advance on the Old; the divine nature, the second person of the Trinity, was just as much on earth then, as now; and all the light, peace and joy, which a sense of the actual nearness, tender guardianship, and personal sympathy of an incarnate Christ, sheds upon the soul, vanish in a haze of hyperboles, a miserable twilight of figures of speech, *and the vigorous and soul-sustaining objectivity of Faith, faints into a mere sentimentality.*" Yes, faith, "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," must faint and sink, if it does not have the body of the Master present, that it may thrust its hands into his side. The germinal idea of this expression, strikes at the very heart of personal religion. For, it seems at least, to imply that our Lord, through his spiritual presence cannot, or does not impart to the Christian's heart, that light, peace and joy which flows from pardoning love. That without the bodily presence, all the peace and joy the Christian believes he feels, is "mere sentimentality." Faith, which sinks and faints in its efforts to follow its Lord from the Cross, to the throne, can feed bountifully on a mysterious and incomprehensible presence. "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

While we believe, and claim that Christ is present in the Eucharist, in what may be properly termed a peculiar manner, yet that peculiarity has no reference to the spiritual essence, or mode of omnipresence or presence, but to that which is imparted to the believer's heart, by the ever present entity. And the following language of Dr. Schaff, we present, as embodying the true idea on this point. "The Lord's Supper, is the solemn festival for the thank-

ful commemoration of the atoning death of Jesus, for the believing appropriation and sealing of the fruits of this death, and for renewing and strengthening the vital union of believers with the ever-living, divine-human Redeemer, as well as with one another. It is thus the sacrament of the *unio mystica*, and of the *communio sanctorum* resting upon it. In it, is the deepest mystery of our faith, as it were continually embodied. In it, the Church with thanksgiving and prayer celebrates and enjoys the highest and closest union, she can ever enjoy on earth, with her heavenly Head, who, though sitting at the right hand of God, and thus partaking of His almighty and omnipresent power, is still, and in fact, for this very reason, invisibly, and yet truly present with her in the Spirit."\*

Another objection to the doctrine of the bodily presence, is that it brings forward the body of Christ to the obscuring, and, I might say, virtual ignoring of his human soul. Of course, its advocates do not deny the Saviour a human soul. This we do not charge. But, that in their system, it becomes to them, a troublesome factor; hence, in order to avoid confusion, it is left as much as possible out of view. It is a significant fact, that in discussing this doctrine, its advocates seem to forget even the existence of our Lord's human soul.†

It is true, the discussion relates to the bodily presence, yet when this, as it is in their system, is based on the nature of the "*Unio hypostatica*," scarcely a step can be taken, until the soul becomes involved. And, when Luther tells us, that we can point to the consecrated bread, and say truly, that is the body of Christ, and to the wine, and say, that is his blood, the question involuntarily arises, where is His soul? When we are told by the Formula, that the real body is broken, distributed and eaten orally, again, the question comes up, where is His soul?

---

\* Hist. Apost. Ch. 582.

† For proof of this assertion, I refer the reader to Luther's long Diss. on the Lord's Supper. To Art. VIII. Epitome, and VIII. of Decl. Form. Con. Also, Dorn, P. C. II. 2. Note 28, p. 415. Where he says, speaking of the Christology of Brentz and Andrew, "But we see from this how, so long as attention was so predominantly directed to the body of Christ, *almost without even a thought being given to His soul*, they robbed themselves of an important link."

While, through the divinity, the body is rendered omnipresent, is the soul confined to that determinate body, or does it participate in the omnipresence?

Even when they use the term, "humanity," "human nature," &c., in this connection, they generally stand as equivalent to body. Take, for instance, the list of attributes ascribed to Christ's human nature, in the Formula of Concord.

"The attributes of the human nature, are these; to be a corporeal creature, to consist of flesh and blood, to be finite and circumscribed, to suffer, to die, to ascend, to descend, to move from place to place, to hunger, to thirst, to experience cold, heat, or similar things."<sup>\*</sup>

Here is a list of the attributes of the human nature, given, with reference to the *communicatio idiomatum*, and yet the chief element, or part of the nature described, is omitted. The very center of the humanity seems, by this doctrine, pushed aside. And, again, we are forced to ask, what is their view of the incarnation? What do they mean by "real incarnation?" Is the human soul the center point of the union? Do they recognize a human *Ego*? Which, although most intimately united with the Logos, and, therewith, forming one person, yet does not lose its identity? By their system, it appears to be either pressed into the physical nature, and made an absolute element of it, or wholly swallowed up by, and lost in the divinity.

Another objection, to this doctrine of the presence, as presented by Dr. Krauth's article, is this: That as according to it, the whole divinity, hence, the "whole Christ," is at and in each and every point of the universe at the same time, throughout and in all things, in heaven and in earth, in another and higher mode than the local and determinate presence; it presents this strange anomaly; that the body of Christ, through the divinity, is present in the determinate body. Not only so, but that the whole Christ is present, in each and every part of that determinate body. And this results in supposing a double Christ—as to His humanity—the one capable of penetrating the other. Otherwise, the divinity in the determinate body ceases to have the same power it has out of it. I am aware, such deductions will be repelled, as con-

\* Bk. Concord, p. 576. Henkel 2d Ed. 1854.

trary to their belief; but the proper question to be decided is, are they legitimate?

Notwithstanding the Dr. is such a strong advocate, for each article and word of the Augsburg Confession, we hold, that this doctrine of the presence, as stated and argued by him, does not accord with it, but stands opposed to it.

The Tenth Article of the *Unaltered* Confession reads as follows:

"Concerning the holy Supper of the Lord, it is taught, that the true body and blood of Christ are truly present, *under the form of bread and wine*, in the Lord's Supper, and are there administered and received. The opposite doctrine is, therefore, rejected."\*

In this article there are two statements in regard to the presence of the body of our Saviour in the Eucharist; first, that it is truly present; second, that it is present "under the form of bread and wine;" or limiting it strictly to the body "under the form of bread." Our proposition in regard to disagreement, relates to the latter statement. We suppose it will be conceded, that "under the form," (*unter der Gestalt,*) has no reference to position. Hence, it must have reference to the mode of presence.†

In order that we may arrive at the true meaning of these words, let us turn to Luther's writings, which, we have already seen the Formula says, set forth more correctly than any other man's writings, the sense and meaning of the Confession.

He tells us, "I maintain, with Wickliff, that bread remains there; on the other hand, I maintain with the Sophists, that the body of Christ is present; and, thus, in defiance of reason, and the most acute logic, that it is very possible for *two distinct substances to be*, and to be called

---

\* This translation is taken from the Book of Concord, published by S. D. Henkel & Bros. 2nd Ed. 1824. The translation of the Augsburg Confession, for this edition, having been revised by C. P. Krauth, D. D., Prof. Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

† We make no reference to the variation of copies of the Confession. We take that which has been accepted by those whose views we oppose, as the "Unaltered Augsburg Confession."

*one essence.*\*\* For, although body and bread are two distinct substances, each one independent in itself, and where they are considered separately, certainly neither can be taken for the other, yet when they are combined, *and become one entire substance*, they then lose their distinctive characters, so far as they constitute *one distinct object*, and as they *actually become, and are but one thing*. Thus, the object is then called and spoken of as one definite object, so that there is no necessity for one of its constituent parts to disappear and yield, but both bread and body remain, and it is properly said, in consequence of the sacramental union, 'This is my body,' *designating the bread by the little word this*. For it is now no longer mere bread from the oven, but flesh-and-bread, (*fleisches Brod*,) or body-and-bread, (*Leibs Brod*,) that is, a bread that has become identical—one sacramental substance—with the body of Christ."†

This language of Luther, is certainly too plain to be misunderstood. It gives the words of the Confession their full and natural force and meaning. The body of the Lord is truly present, *in or under the form of the bread*. The bread and body without losing their natural qualities, become one. So that when we point to the bread, we can truly say, that is the body of Christ. Not that the empty circumambient air is the body also; but that the bread in its length and breadth is the body of Christ. And, hence, it is present under the *form of the bread*.

Turn to the Formula, (p. 667,) and there we find the same interpretation. "And Dr. Luther, who certainly understood the true and proper meaning of the Augsburg Confession, rather than others, and constantly adhered to it, and defended it, till the end of his life, in his last Confession, a little before his death, confessed his faith concerning this Article, with great zeal, and repeated it in the following words, where he thus writes: 'I reckon all those in the same number, that is, as sacramentarians and fanatics—for such they are—who will not believe that the bread of the Lord in the Supper, *is his true natural body*, which the ungodly, or Judas, as well as Peter and all other saints, *receive orally*; whoever, I say, will not believe this, should let me alone, and not expect to hold fellowship with me; and to this principle I must adhere.' From this exposition, but more especially from Dr. Luther's explanation,

\* Diss. L. S. Sec. 337.

† Sec. 355.

who is the principle divine of the Augsburg Confession, every intelligent person, who loves truth and peace, can perceive with certainty, what has always been the proper meaning and sense of the Augsburg Confession, concerning this article."

This is the interpretation of Article X, the Dr. and all those holding with him, have bound themselves to. These words are plain and emphatic, and seem to have been written by Luther as a last determined expression of his view on this point, that it might not be frittered away by mysterious explanations. We admit that Luther also wrote and argued in regard to the incomprehensible mode of presence, but these are the words the Formula has selected as the true exposition of this doctrine.\*

Now, we ask any Lutheran to place Dr. Krauth's statement of this doctrine by the side of the tenth Article of the Confession, as thus explained by Luther, and see if he can say they agree with each other.

How can the natural body of Christ be present under the *form* of bread, broken by the minister, distributed to the communicants, and eaten by them; and yet the natural body not present in a determinate sense, but the only presence in a mode that is supernatural, *illocal, incomprehensible*, yet real, through its union with the divinity? And eaten not \*\* naturally, carnally, physically or locally, but supernaturally, mystically, heavenly, spiritually.

Perhaps a way of escape may be sought in the distinction that may be made between "presence" and "mode of presence" between "mode" and "form." We will not here stop to argue this matter, we know there is a distinction to be made between the terms, but in their present use, we defy the Dr. or any one else, to define a mode of presence applicable to the point, without describing the presence itself. In this case, the one involves the other. And the word "form" in the Confession, is used precisely in the same sense he uses mode, otherwise, one or the other is meaningless.

Let us place the Dr's language, the Confession and Luther side by side, and see the contrast.

Dr. Krauth; "That after *another mode*, (not in virtue of

---

\* These extracts from Luther, were inserted in the Formula through the influence of the Suabians, who thus obtained the establishing of their stronger view, against the milder view of Chemnitz. Dorner, P. Ch. D. II. Vol. 2 : p. 215.

its own essential qualities, not a *determinate presence*,) supernatural, *illokal, incomprehensible*, and yet real, it is rendered present 'where Christ will,' through the divine nature. The Confession; "The true body and blood are truly present, *under the form of bread and wine*." Luther; "His *true natural body* by the ungodly and saints is received orally. \* \* Though the body and bread are two distinct substances, \* \* they are combined, and become one entire substance. \* \* Both body and bread remain, and it is properly said, in consequence of the sacramental union; 'This is my body,' designating the bread. \* \* Bread which has become identical, one sacramental substance, *with the body of Christ*."

Again, I ask, is there perfect harmony between these? Nay, more, does not the first stand in direct opposition to the second, as explained by the third? The attempt to take shelter under the broad mantle of incomprehensibility, looks very much like a conceded inability to defend the doctrine advocated.

The Dr. says, "The Lord's body has no determinate, natural, local or comprehensible presence, or mode of presence on earth." The Confession replies, "It is in the form of bread;" and Luther adds, "Yes, that bread is the body, and the natural body too." And both, (Luther and the Confession,) join in exclaiming, "When the minister breaks the bread, and distributes to Christian and sinner, he breaks the true natural body, and with his hands presents it to the communicants." The Dr's theory says, "Nay, the bread is broken, but the whole Christ is in each fragment, and all around it, for there is as much of Christ at one point as another."

Nor are other advocates any nearer in harmony with each other. Let us compare a few, chiefly selecting the Dr's quotations.

One says, "We neither believe in *Impanation* or *Consubstantiation*." The Confession says, "Under the form of bread." Another says, "But in neither sense can that monstrous doctrine of consubstantiation be attributed to our Church, since Lutherans do not believe either in that local conjunction of two bodies, *nor in any commingling of bread and of Christ's body*, of wine and of his blood." Luther contends that, "They are combined, and become one entire substance." The Dr. denies that the doctrine of ubiquity is taught. The Formula condemns the doctrine,

"That God with all His omnipotence, is not able to provide that the body of Christ shall not be essentially, or substantially, at one time, in more than one place." Another asserts, "Nor do we believe in that consubstantiative presence, which some define to be the inclusion of one substance in another." The Formula condemns the idea, "That believers should not seek the body of Christ in the bread and wine of the holy Supper."

They abhor the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, yet teach that "On account of their sacramental union, the bread and wine are truly the body and blood of Christ."

They admit,\* "There is one mode of partaking of the flesh of Christ, which is spiritual, and that this spiritual eating is nothing else but faith." But add that "there is another mode which is oral or sacramental when in the Lord's Supper, the true essential body and blood of Christ are received and partaken of orally.

Yet, in explanation, they say that this mode though not spiritual, is "supernatural, illocal, incomprehensible, being rendered present through the divine nature."

Can any one tell us whereabouts, between the spiritual presence and transubstantiation, a spot is left for their doctrine to rest its foot upon?

Well may the question be asked, in good faith, what is their belief on this point? And the Dr. fearing, perhaps, that some "evangelical Lutheran," may get lost amid this theological maze, and be unable to give an intelligent answer to the question, "How can Christ's human nature be present with us," puts this answer into his mouth. "He can reply, after the manner in which an infinite spirit renders present a human nature, which it has taken to be an inseparable constituent of its own person, a manner most real, but utterly incomprehensible to us." It is exactly as it is. And yet this is the answer to be given in regard to a "fundamental doctrine."

Last, though not least, we ask, is the doctrine as thus set forth by the Dr. and others, drawn from the words of the Saviour, at the institution of the Lord's Supper?

As the argument on this point, has already been so ably presented in the *Review*, in the Article of Prof. Sternberg, we will not attempt to go over the same ground again; but will content ourself with simply bringing the Scrip-

tural narrative, and Dr. Krauth's statement of this doctrine together.

"It was evening, the appointed hour at which our Lord desired to eat the passover, when he set down with the twelve apostles. And, as they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples and said, Take eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." "This do in remembrance of me."

Here is a plain, unembellished narrative, which, so far as the statement of the transaction is concerned, cannot be simplified. While they are at table, Jesus takes some of the bread before them, and of which they had been eating, and solemnly blesses it, or gives thanks in reference to it, then breaks it, and presents it to His disciples, saying, as he hands it to them, "Take eat; this is my body."

Doubtless, a deep and unusual solemnity fell upon that little group. Nor are we unfurling too freely the wings of our imagination, when we say, that an expression of holy sadness, perhaps, then began to show itself, on the beloved countenance of their Lord, who felt the approach of that mighty contest, which He had to undergo. And, it is more than probable, that the disciples were expecting some great event to happen, and were prepared in part, for strange occurrences.

Be this as it may, the startling announcement, that one of them should betray him; and that He would not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until He should drink it anew with them in his Father's kingdom; must have filled their souls with the deepest solemnity, and fixed indelibly upon their hearts and memory every word and act of their beloved Master.

And, when he lay buried in the tomb, doubtless, the words, "This do in remembrance of me," brought back to memory, every act and expression of that solemn occasion, with life-like vividness. Yea, after their gloom had been dispelled by their risen Lord; after He had given his last charge, and had ascended to his Father, these words at each communion feast, placed them again in memory, with Christ at that solemn feast, but now, the sad cloud that then hung over them, was removed. And as they broke bread and handed to their disciples, saying,

"Take eat; this is my body," repeating their Lord's words; how clearly would memory show to them the broken bread in their Saviour's hands, its form, its very shadings were faithfully preserved; but, more than all, the words, the tones, the voice, the countenance, the melting love of Him who held it.

What then did they, Peter, James and John, and the other disciples who were present, understand by these important words. When Jesus handed them the broken bread, which he held in his hand, saying, "Take eat; this is my body," how did they understand it.

Let Dr. Krauth answer, for we presume he claims that he gives the same interpretation upon these words, that Peter, James and John did; and that he understands them in the same sense they did. Therefore, we will present his doctrine, and the doctrine of the Formula, as an answer to the question. It runs, in substance, thus: That when the Lord said, "This is my body," he meant that the bread which he designated by the little word *this*, was really and truly his natural body. But he did not mean that his body (which they saw before them,) had been changed into the bread which he held in his hand; nor that this bread which had been lying on the table in view, had been suddenly changed into his body. Nor did he mean that his body had been mingled in a local manner, with the bread; or that it was locally shut up in it. He did not mean that, in a spiritual sense, or spiritual manner, this was his body, or that he was only spiritually present in it. He did not mean that "this bread represents my broken body." He did not wish his disciples to understand these words in a figurative sense. But he did intend them to understand, that although they saw his local and determinate body before them, yet, that through his divine nature, his body "after another mode, supernatural, illocal, incomprehensible, and yet real, was rendered present" in the bread. That when he said to them, as he handed them the bread, "This is my body," such was his meaning. Did Peter so understand the words of his beloved Master? Did John who leaned upon his Lord, rest his hope of blessing and comfort on such a metaphysical process of reasoning as this? Would the eminently practical James, if he rejected the idea of any figure, have been satisfied with such an intangible, incomprehensible bodily presence as this? And how with doubting Thomas? Had he under-

stood his Master, that his words were in no sense figurative, would he not have said, Show us Lord, how can this be?

We make no further comments on this comparison. Can such a mystical doctrine as this, be legitimately drawn from our Saviour's words? Is it not rather founded on the idea they hold of the nature of the hypostatical union? And would it not be, so far as their process of reasoning is concerned, just as true without the Saviour's words instituting his Supper, as with them?

The truth is, as we understand it, that between *transubstantiation* and the *symbolic representation*, there can come no consistent doctrine. There is not a foot-hold between these two, but what is slippery ground, and surrounded by fogs and mists. Hear the worthy Mosheim, who feels himself afloat, without a land-mark to guide him: "What the nature of this presence is, we do not know. The thing itself we know; but the mode of its truth is a mystery which we cannot comprehend. Should any one ask, How is he present? our answer is, We know not."

If we cut loose from our anchorage, in the symbolic view, we are tending toward the hard shores of transubstantiation. Luther attempted, and did break loose from the latter, and, although he did not reach the point which we think the true one, yet we must ever admire and cherish a love for that bold and noble champion and leader of the great Reformation, as we behold him tearing loose, one after another, of the superstitious bonds that bound the Bride of Jesus. He plants his feet upon the Word as the only sure foundation, and he clings closely to the letter, lest, through interpretation, danger may ensue. And boldly and nobly does he wield the lance against every one who refuses to stand by his side. See him, at Marburg; although we differ from Luther, as to his view on this point, and lean in opinion, somewhat toward the position of Ecolampadius and Zwingle, though by no means, wholly embracing it; yet, as we imagine him standing beneath the arches of King's Hall, pointing to the words before him, and hear his firm voice ring out, "Most dear sirs, since my Lord Jesus Christ says, *Hoc est corpus meum*, I believe that his body is really there," we can but admire him. This same firm spirit shook the seat of Popedom. And we acknowledge that we agree with Dr. Krauth, when in speaking of Luther, he says, "Surely, that is a

glorious error, if error it be, which springs from trusting too far, too implicitly, in too child-like a way, in the simple words of our adorable Lord." Yet Luther was but a man, and we wonder that so few shreds of the bonds, that bound him, yet clung to him. He was the chosen vessel in the hands of God, to perform a mighty work; and nobly did he do the duty assigned him.

Before closing, we may add, that some of the leading Lutheran divines of Europe, who once held with Dr. Krauth's view, are conceding the symbolic explanation of our Saviour's words; as Martensen, Kahnis, &c.

The general tendency is evidently in this direction; therefore, we may fairly conclude, that the movement in our own country, in the opposite direction, is but spasmodical, a mere reaction of the wave, that is driven before the deep substratum moving beneath.



## ARTICLE II.

### THE KEYS.\*

By Rev. G. H. N. PETERS, Springfield, Ohio.

In our former article on this subject, we traced the views that were entertained, respecting Math. 16: 18, 19, by the early Fathers of the Church, Pope Gelasius and his successors, and the Reformers. The details given, and the history referred to, indicated that the interpretation of this passage moulded, in a remarkable manner, the destiny of the Church, and of the world.

The Reformation, by fully restoring and reaffirming the expositions of the Fathers, diminished the practical working of those Keys. The Popes, feeling them to be too ponderous for their hands, and realizing that their weight was causing them to slip from their grasp, promised, in order to retain them, reformation, and then resorted to political artifice and intrigue, to secure the warlike co-op-

\* Concluded from p. 269.

eration of kings and nations. Those arts were only too successful, not indeed, in causing the power of the Keys to be perfectly restored, or even to influence the disenthralled to again submit to the yoke, but in plunging nations into the most bitter and long-continued wars, and in shedding the blood of a vast multitude. For, it is a singular result of the Reformation, that whilst the Roman See has never recalled the Gelasian and Hildebrandic interpretation of the passage under review, it has been unable, down to the present day, to enforce it on Roman Catholic nations. Whilst the latter are willing to accept it in part, yet kings and statesmen, enlightened by the past, are unwilling to save themselves and their privileges, to acknowledge that primacy and supremacy in the sense once universally believed. They, in point of fact, now stand where Luther stood when he contested with Dr. Eck. The Popes, seeing that it would be impolitic, do not press the subject of supremacy in temporal matters, and are willing to avoid agitation and damaging conflicts with nations, to rest content, in a subdued form of primacy and supremacy in spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs. They do not desire the question, for reasons already given, to be minutely discussed, and have no particular love for either Romanists or Protestants who now undertake to review, in confirmation or rejection, the venerable claim. Indeed, so delicate has the subject become, that for a long time, if we are properly informed, they have ceased to send to kings and nobles, and the great, those keys, once the proud symbol of a power really possessed, and, in some instances, the bearers of a wonderful virtue.\* Although the time has passed for the holy Father to obtain decisions in his favor,

---

\* I remind the reader of the Keys of gold, silver and other metals, that were laid on the tomb of St. Peter, and then sent to princes and others, to assure them of the favor and love of the door keeper of heaven, and of the Clavigers, the Key-bearing vicars. Sometimes those Keys by adding the filings of the chains, by which the apostles Peter and Paul were bound, (like the one forwarded to the queen of king Osway of England,) or by some other manipulations obtained the miraculous power of working miracles. One of the most remarkable of these Keys, is attested and vouched for by Gregory the Great. It is the one sent to Theotistes and Andrew the governors of the children of the Emperor Mauritius. See the account as given by him in Bower's *His. Popes*, Vol. I. p. 463. We may well imagine

based on (like king Osway's related by Bede,) the Key derived power found in Christ's address to Peter, yet it is a truth that the old interpretation introduced by Galasius, and developed by others, is still the favorite one of Rome. The canons of the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon, the decrees of Justinian and others, based on such canons, are scarcely a proof of divine right, and hence, whilst by no means discarded, are superseded by an appeal to Math. 16: 18, 19. To-day the old interpretation stands unrepealed, and we are gravely informed, that the words, in the first clause of the passage, expresses the primacy of Peter, that he is the chief or prince of the apostles. By skilfully assuming that the Pope is a regular successor of St. Peter, and that, in view of a visible unity, &c., such a primacy is regularly transferred to each successor, the links of a connected chain are formed. This idea of primacy is not sufficient to satisfy pride and ambition. Next we are told, that the rest of the passage plainly gives the Keys of the kingdom of heaven to Peter and his successors, as evinced in this primacy, and the power of binding and loosening. And, finally, that the supremacy, represented by the Keys, gives supreme legislative, executive and judicial power in all ecclesiastical affairs.\* This last feature engrafted, culminated in the deposing of kings, the absolving of subjects from oaths of allegiance, and the disposing of kingdoms. It may, indeed, be admitted, that even some Roman Catholic writers† have denominated

---

trivial as the thing may appear, what awe this Key was to inspire in those destined for an imperial station. It was associated with the fearful death of an unbeliever—perhaps an unintentional unbeliever.

\* That this is not overstated, I refer to "the Dictates" of Hildebrand, the Lives of the Popes, immediately preceding and following the Hildebrandic period, the annals and labors of Bellarmine and Baronius, to establish this view, the testimony of Romanist and Protestant church historians, and the history of nations who resisted this claim, and were urged to war in antagonism to it. In this country efforts are made to conceal or underate the effectual witnessing of history, saying, that the Pope acted as supreme Judge, in deciding concerning empires and kingdoms in temporal matters when solicited, or when the necessities of the Church demanded it, &c., &c. See, also, Schmucker's *Pop. Theol.* ch. 27.

† Especially by those in the interests of kings who were striving to resist the encroachments of the Pope's temporal power.

this climax, this last development of power, to be a "Hildebrandine heresy," but, that it also stands unrepealed, is seen in the canonization of Hildebrand, and his being honored as a saint, in the teachings of their standards in theology, in the boasted perpetuity and infallibility of their canons and decrees, if confirmed by Pope and Council, and even in the principles of the honored and stately repeated famous bull, *In Cœna Domini*.\*

On the other hand, the Reformers and their co-laborers, discarding the Popish view, returned to the interpretation of the passage, as given by the Fathers. To avoid undue repetition, we shall introduce their explanations in part, with that of others, whilst endeavoring to present a continuous (and to us a consistent) explanation of what we deem the true meaning of the passage. Whilst we cheerfully acknowledge our indebtedness to all these, and lay no claim to originality, in the conception of the various points thus brought together, yet, we deem it proper to say, that thus endorsing what others have truly and plainly said, we do not find in our reading, (although such may exist, owing to our imperfect acquaintance with many writers, whom we only know through quotations,) one writer who has adopted, from the varied interpretations, precisely the following explanation. The combination of several views, one part held by this one, and the other by

---

\* This could be illustrated by the more recent action and words of the Pope towards King Emanuel, the allocution directed against laws enacted by Austria, &c. In the latter, it may be appropriate to recall the fact, that the holy Father, in virtue of the inherited power vested in him, declares that those laws, (withdrawing in part the bondage of ages,) are "null and powerless in themselves and in their effects, both as regards the present and the future," and exhorts all, "not to forget the censures and spiritual punishments which the ecclesiastical institutions and Ecumenical councils inflict, as having been deserved *ipso facto* by the violators of the rights of the Church. Scarcely any document of importance is issued from the Papal See, in which we do not find, notwithstanding its crippled resources, when compared with its former estate,) the spirit, if not the full claim, put forth. Thus, in the late bull, of an Ecumenical or General Council, this document even has to conclude with a dammatory clause, derived from this interpretation. For it declares, that if any one dares to oppose it, or controveine it, "he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of his apostles Peter and Paul."

another, long since privately entertained, seemed necessary to secure the full import of the passage. How successfully this may be accomplished, is left to the judgment and intelligence of the reader. It also does not fall within the scope or design of this article to refute the claim of the Popes, the Gelasian and Hildebrandic theory, saving the refutation that naturally arises from the exegetical examination of the passage, on which it is based. The former is done in detail by the masterly production of Barrow on the Pope's supremacy, the latter may, at least, be confirmed by a renewed investigation.

Preliminary to the passage itself, a few remarks respecting the context may be necessary, as an introductory. The particular honor here bestowed on Peter, is connected with the answer he was permitted to give to a question proposed by Christ. After asking and receiving an answer to the question: "*Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?*" he proposes another, "*But whom say ye that I am?*" Peter replies: "*Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,*" or as others viewing it, in the terms of both questions, "*Thou, the Son of Man, art the Christ, the Son of the living God.*" Without pausing to contemplate how far this expressed Peter's faith either in the incarnation of God the Son in Christ, or, in the person of Jesus, as the predicted Messiah, who should establish and gloriously reign in the promised kingdom, it is sufficient for the present purpose to say, that in consideration of this direct confession of faith, our Saviour pronounces him "blessed." "*And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.*" This blessing, for which he is reminded of his indebtedness to the Father, consisted, not only in his being honored with this revelation, but in the promise immediately added, that, in some sense, the Church should be built upon him, and that in order to fulfil the divine purpose, certain Keys would be given him.

"*And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church.*" The grammatical connection, as well as the reason following, for the name thus given, teaches unquestionably, that Peter himself is meant. If Peter is not personally designated, then language fails to express a plain, unequivocal sense in sentences. Peter is the Rock, and on this Rock, that is on Peter, the Church

is built. The same figure of a foundation is afterward employed (Eph. 2 : 20, Rev. 21 : 14,) to designate all the Apostles, but that illustration, as will shortly appear, is not applicable to this passage, is not parallel with it, simply because, however much the other Apostles may have afterward partaken of Peter's honor and blessedness, he is singled out, chosen from all the rest, as the exclusive recipient of this promised honor. The early Fathers were so rooted in this opinion, that they bestowed names and titles on Peter, expressive of his having a pre-eminence; and in all expositions, (at least those accessible to us,) whatever interpretation is presented, there is an acknowledgment in some form or other, that a certain precedence must be allowed to Peter. But the difficulty, is to state in what this pre-eminence consisted. This will be considered in the next verse. There is no doubt, that the Roman church, insisting on the natural connection and construction of the sentence, in order to advance their application of it, has influenced many to deny or conceal, or substitute in part, lest too great a concession be made in favor of that Church. Hence, whilst several explanations are extensively used by commentators, theologians and others, we are glad to see that the truth, so obviously taught, is frankly acknowledged in commentaries designed for the masses, and in works more particularly written for the guidance of theological students.\* The honor that rightfully belongs to Peter, an honor specially conferr'd by Jesus Christ, should not be given to others. Something that distinguishes him from all others is evidently and designedly granted, and, instead of forsaking the legitimate meaning of any sentence, it should be our business, with scriptural evidence, to ascertain what this preference or dignity really embraces. Therefore, with the greatest respect for the venerable and eminent men who have held them, we must discard every interpretation that serves to

---

\* Thus, *i. e.*, Barnes' Notes on Math. 16 : 17, and Horne's Introd. Vol. I. p. 343. Barnes says, "The word *rock* refers to *Peter himself*. this is the obvious meaning of the passage." Horne declares, "The connection shows that Peter is here plainly meant, *Thou art Peter*, says Christ, and *upon this rock*, that is, *Peter*, pointing to him; for thus it connects with the reason which follows for the name, in the same manner as the reason is given for that of Abraham, in Gen. 17 : 5, and by Israel in Gen. 32 : 28." The "pointing to him," may or may not be correct.

detract from Peter's honor, or refuses to acknowledge a decided precedence in him; yea, more, that does not allow him a certain primacy belonging exclusively to himself, and not transferable to others. We can have no sympathy with that mode of exposition which undertakes to transpose this building on Peter, from him to a building on Christ, asserting that a building the Church on Peter is contrary to the announcement, that Christ is the only foundation. (1 Cor. 3 : 11.) The fact is, that each of the modes of building presented, are true, the Church is built on Christ, on the Apostles, and on Peter, but each one of these stands on its own merits. There is a sense in which Christ, the Head over all, is the only foundation, and one in which the Apostles, equally, are foundations, and a third, in which Peter alone is a foundation. We therefore, must decline to accept views, which, although far more plausible than those alleged by Romanists, refuse to bestow on Peter that distinction and privilege that rightfully belong to him. Some, making a distinction between *πέτρος* and *πέτρα*, inform us, by extended paraphrasing, that its meaning is: "Thou art a little stone; and on thee, Peter, if I were to build my Church, it would fall. It is upon this great, imbedded, immovable, eternal rock, (pointing to himself, viz.: Christ,) that I will build my Church."\* Others, without insisting on the difference between the two words, still tell us that when Christ uttered the words, "upon this rock," he turned from Peter, and in some way, by pointing, or otherwise, directed attention to himself. Admitting the appeal to classical authorities, to show a slight diversity in the two words, we might assume, for the paraphrase and pointing are mere assumption, that although Peter was a stone, yet for the purpose contemplated, Christ would make him a rock; or in other words, weak and insufficient as Peter was, yet he should receive strength to become a mighty instrument. Aside from the conjectures embraced in such an opinion, the grammatical construction is opposed to it, there being a direct and explicit reference to Peter himself. Another view, more feasible is this: "Thou art Peter (*πέτρος*, the man who is as

\* Thus, i. e., Dr. Cummings' Lec. on Romanism. See "The Barnet Discussion," p. 445. If my remembrance is correct, in some other place he also teaches that the rock is the confession of faith made by Peter.

a rock,) and upon this rock, (viz.: Peter's confession, which, like a rock, cannot be shaken,) I will build my Church."<sup>\*</sup> Here it is intimated, that because of Peter's characteristics, such as, earnestness, decision, and firmness, he is merely complimented, and then, attention is directed, not to Peter himself, but to his confession, previously made. Writers who adopt such an opinion, hampered by the construction of the sentence, and desirous not to exclude Peter entirely, still differ from each other respecting the slight shade of meaning to be attached to the words *πέτρος* and *πέτρα*, (the early Fathers had no such difficulties,) and more particularly, concerning the confession itself. Some think the former word denotes a rock, others, that it signifies a stone, and that there is a rise, rhetorical, in the sentence; some, the prevailing view among them, believe that the latter word, rock or confession denoted by it, is simply faith in the Messiah, as expressed by Peter, or the truth embraced in and connected with Peter's answer to Christ; others tell us that the mystery of the incarnation is meant. Among those varied interpretations (indicating the difficulty of the passage, if the plain meaning is set aside,) we shall select one ingeniously advanced: "Thou art Peter, (that is, that thou art he who has rightly declared the mystery of my person, as the Son of Man,) and upon this rock (this foundation, meaning God's work of revealing to His elect people, the mystery of the incarnation,) I will build," &c.† All such explanations, whatever truth they may contain in the abstract, are open to the serious and incontrovertible objection, that in opposition to the plain grammatical construction they substitute for the person of Peter, something else not specified in the text. They are mere assumptions and inferences. This is exposed by the fact, that the greatest and best of men adopting them have not confined themselves to one interpretation. The Fathers, the Reformers and others, would sometimes call the rock Peter, sometimes Christ, and, on other occasions, the confession of faith or truth. To give an illustration: Augustine gives two interpretations of the rock, one referring it to Peter, the other to Christ, and in his Book of Retractions, says: "I have said in a certain passage, respecting the Apostle Peter, that the Church is founded upon him,

\* Thus, i. e., Dr. Kurtz, Sac. History, p. 293.

† See Dr. Joens' Notes on Scripture, p. 158.





as upon a rock. \* \* \* But I know that I have frequently afterward so expressed myself that the phrase, 'upon this rock,' should be understood to be the rock which Peter confessed. For it was not said to him, Thou art *μετερπα*, but, Thou art *μετερπος*; for the rock was Christ." The Reformers, pressed by the construction, fell back on the expositions of the Fathers, and, whilst endorsing the idea that Peter was, in some respects, specially honored, affirmed that the rock was either Christ, or the confession made by Peter. Sometimes the one view is given, and then again, the other is presented.† Gathering from all these sources and keeping before us the grammatical force of the sentence, we are inclined to the view, that the name Peter is given to Simon because of the confession made by him, for the contrast of the original name, Simon Bar-jona, is significant. We also think that the meaning of that word, notwithstanding the few classical authorities so laboriously hunted up, cannot be that of "a little stone," for, if the name is bestowed on account of the confession, just made by Simon, the name, given in consideration of that confession, would virtually be a lessening, (belittling) or diminishing of the confession itself.\* The cogency of

† The writer was tempted to trace these views, but admonished by the length of the article, forbears, saying, that this is seen in the discussion between Luther and Dr. Eck, Luther's Appeal to the Emperor and nobility, &c. Zwingle also said, "The foundation of the Church is the same rock, the same Christ, that gave Peter his name, because he confessed him faithfully," whilst in other places he refers to the confession of faith of Peter. It appears, if not mistaken, that they sometimes used these as convertible expressions, for, in opposition to Dr. Eck, Luther endorses both Augustine when he makes the rock to be Christ, and Ambrose when he says, "On that confession of faith the Church is built." It will be seen by reference to Barrow's Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy, that some of the Fathers, by the rock, understood Peters person, others Peters faith, others Christ himself, others Peter including all the Apostles with him. A large number of instances are given, derived from their writings, and on this diversity of interpretation, and ever shifting from one to the other. Barrow, like the Reformers, skillfully arranges a number of arguments against Papal pretensions.

\* Bengel, *Gnomon loci*, says: "It is not fitting that such a man

the word Peter lies in the Confession itself. Next, we believe that Simon thus named is personally addressed; for, advantage is taken of the name thus given, meaning a rock or huge stone, (suitable for a foundation,) and the figure of building upon it, is forcibly introduced. Hence, we read it: "Thou art Peter, (a foundation stone or rock,) and upon this rock (or foundation, that is, Peter himself,) I will build," &c. In what way he becomes such a foundation, is stated in the next verse.\*

"*And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*" The prevailing view of this phrase, although fortified by the names of a host of distinguished writers, we are compelled to discard. Whatever of truth there may be in the declarations fastened on it, that the enemies of the Church, devils and wicked men, should not be able to overcome it, it is also true, that these comments are far-fetched, and do not legitimately flow from the text. We are told that because gates in the walls of ancient cities were used for holding courts, transacting business and deliberating, the word must here be understood to mean "councils, designs, machinations, evil purposes;" and the word "hell, means here, *the place of departed spirits, particularly evil spirits;*" and from hence, "the meaning of the passage is, that all the *plots, stratagems, and machinations* of the enemies of the Church should not be able to overcome it." By the word hell, others include not only the devils, evil spirits, but all wicked men, or men opposed to the Church, because led by Satan. But, why go so far to secure a secondary meaning for the word gates, and the word hell? We are not called on to defend the wild fancies of incipient monkery and established Popery, and, therefore, can return to the primary meaning of these words. Gates being designed for defence, become thus emblematic of power, strength, dominion, and are thus used in numerous passages of Scripture. Hades, translated hell, denotes the

---

should be called *nérpa*, with a feminine termination; on the other hand St. Matthew would gladly have written *éní tōtō tū nérpa*, if the idiom would have allowed it; wherefore these two, *nérpa* and *nérpos*, stand for one name and thing, as both words are expressed in Syriac by the one noun, *Kephā*."

\* Bengel has some excellent remarks in his *Gnomon*, and Olshausen *Com. loci*, showing that in any interpretation, the person of Peter, must not be discarded.

grave, death, or the place of the departed. Dr. Knapp, in his Lectures on Theology, p. 545, (and with whom all our best critics correspond,) says: "The term Hades is not used in the Scriptures, to designate specifically this place, (viz.: the place of punishment after the judgment,) for Hades is the name given to the kingdom of the dead, *where the righteous and the wicked both abide after death.*" Some interpret it as if it read the gates of Tartarus, or the gates of Gehenna; and some commentators, actually forgetting the meaning of the word Hades, as given by themselves in other places, agreeably to Dr. Knapp's definition, make the plots, &c., of Hades, an imputation on the righteous. For, undesignedly, they charge the inhabitants of Hades with plotting, &c., against the Church, and as the righteous are also in Hades, (even as Christ was,) they virtually accuse them of trying to overthrow the Church. Such is the absurdity into which we fall, if we thus explain the passage. We, therefore, vastly prefer the version given by Dr. Jones, without comment in his Notes on Scripture, (with whom others agree,) "The gates of hell (that is the death) shall not prevail against it." The entire phrase, therefore, imports that the power, strength, or dominion, exercised by death, shall not prevail to overcome the Church. The gates of Hades could not retain Jesus Christ, and they will not hold the righteous who shall, by the power of a better resurrection, come from the land of the enemy. Therefore, it is, that in strict accordance with this promise, the Apostle, when describing the resurrection of the righteous, exclaims, "O grave, (marginal reading, hell, so Luther's version,) or Hades, *where is thy victory?*" We regard the expression equivalent to that employed in Scripture, "the gates of death," with the idea of place attached.\* The explanation given by many Commentators of Acts 2:27, 31, completely refutes their previously rendered one of this passage.

---

\* As the writer holds to the doctrine of the first resurrection, as held by Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and a host of others, he may, disclaiming the idea of obtruding his Millenarian views, in a foot note, be allowed to say: That he regards this passage, as one of those indirect, but beautiful confirmations of his doctrine, that after the first resurrection only, when the gates of Hades are open to the righteous, but remain closed to the wicked, until the thousand years are ended, the Church, thus delivered from the bondage of death, (that is the

*"And I will give unto thee the Keys of the kingdom of heaven."* The plural form indicates that more than one Key is intended. The Fathers, the Reformers, Commentators and others, generally speak of two keys, and that this is the number, will appear evident from what follows. The word "Key," is used Luke 11:52, to denote the means or power of attaining knowledge, and Rev. 1:18; Isa. 22:22, &c., power or authority. Perhaps, Christ had in his mind, the custom mentioned by a Commentator. Dr. Clarke, *Com. loci*, states, that when the Jews made a doctor of laws, they put into his hand the Key of the closet in the temple, where the sacred books were kept. This was regarded as emblematic of the power, or authority, or means given to explain and expound the books of the law. Whether the Saviour thus alluded to this practice or not, all admit that these Keys were committed to Peter, (the Romanists confining them to him; the Fathers, Protestants and others, agreeing that they are first given to him, and then extended to the other apostles,)\* and that

---

*Ecclesia*, the company of those called forth, separated or elected first is to be exalted. The key to these gates, now at the girdle of the coming One will not only deliver from the enemy still oppressing them, but will open to those prisoners (so called) an entrance into that honor, power, glory, priesthood, and kingship, promised. The gates, alas, are firmly closed, and the departed and departing *Ecclesia* cannot come to us, but we are assured, by the precedent given through the Redeemer, that He has power to open them. May He hasten that happy period! The reader will pardon this allusion, (which gives a glimpse of the full import of the promise,) the more readily, when he reflects, that not only Chiliasm have taught, that the exalted condition of the Church predicted and still future is preceded by a literal first resurrection, or deliverance from "the gates of death," and "Hades," but, that even some of our most bitter opponents, have admitted and taught the same, limiting it, however, to the martyrs, and, perhaps, to some of the eminently pious. See, for instance, Prof. Stuart's *Com. on Rev.* ch. 20, and several *Excursus* based on that chapter. This introduces the subject noticed by Paul, 1 Cor. 15:13—19, of the necessity of the resurrection of the righteous, to assure a perfected Redemption.

\* This needs a slight modification, even some few Romanists have in part adopted the views of Protestants; and a few Protestants have in part adopted the opinion of Romanists, viz.: that the power

they gave him the power, or authority, or means by which persons, others, are introduced into, or rendered worthy of, the kingdom of heaven. Whilst we may cordially endorse the position of some popular Commentators, (*i. e.*, Barnes) that by the bestowal of these Keys, Christ "means that He will make him (Peter) the instrument, of opening the door of faith to the world, the first to preach the Gospel to both Jews and Gentiles;" yet, this is far from giving us the full import of the passage. Whilst Peter is made such an instrument, it is said, that he becomes such by first preaching, &c., but this really is waiving the question of the Keys. That he is to become such an instrumentality, we already infer from the previous promise, that the Church is to be built upon him; that he is to preach, is true of all the others, and his being *first* to preach, is only *a part* of the honor due to him. To enable Peter to become this instrument, and to preach first to Jews and Gentiles, certain Keys are given to him, and the question still remains unanswered, *what are these Keys?*\* The only way to an-

---

of the Keys is solely given to Peter. Thus, *i. e.*, in reference to the latter, Barnes' *Com. loci*, says: "The 'power of the Keys' was given to *Peter alone*, solely for this reason; the power of 'binding and loosening' on earth was given to the other apostles with him." The fact is, both parties hold to a portion of the truth; it is true, that these keys were first given to Peter, and, without their being thus given, the power prefigured, could not have been exercised, and in this sense, they were alone bestowed on Peter; but, it is equally true, that taking the very interpretations of the Keys presented by them, the same power, *saving the priority in their use*, was given to others, and in the case of Paul, without previous consultation with others. Hence, it is not strictly correct, to confine the power of the Keys to Peter alone, because he had a priority in their use, and, it is not proper to say, that the power of the Keys was given in the same way to all the apostles, because, that would be overlooking this priority. Our language should be such, that we neither deny Peter's precedence or pre-eminence in this respect, nor refuse to bestow the same power to all the other apostles.

\* Luther's views respecting the Keys may be briefly expressed. He endorses the idea, that they consist in proclaiming the terms of salvation, as Peter did to both Jews and Gentiles; that all can use these Keys; and that the Gospel is thus proclaimed, then is attached the power of declaring absolution, in the case of those who accept, and condemnation in those who reject the conditions of salvation.

swer with confidence, is to investigate the record of Peter's apostleship, and see whether any Keys were bestowed upon him, by which not only authority was given, but by which this door was opened. After the ascension of the Lord, the apostles waited at Jerusalem, for the promised Comforter. On the day of Pentecost, the first Key was given. Filled with the Spirit, Peter proclaimed, (Acts 2: 14-46,) the crucified, risen Redeemer, to be the promised Christ or Messiah, who should sit on David's throne, and who should remain at the right hand of God, until the period of royal manifestation. The unbelieving Jews, now convinced by the miraculous outpouring, the former life of Jesus, the emphatic language of Peter, that this same Jesus, whom they had mercilessly crucified, was, indeed, both Lord and Christ, were deeply affected, and asked: "*Men and brethren, what shall we do?*" Well might they ask such a momentous question, guilty as they were of the most stupendous crime, that of slaying their own promised Messiah, the royal seed of David, the Son of God. Where was the man with the adequate knowledge and authority to answer it, so that forgiven, they also might enter the kingdom of God? He stands, happy provision, before them. It is Peter. The Key of authority, and of knowledge is committed to him, and he, standing up, graciously informs these Jewish people, that wicked as they were, they still could be saved. Clad with authority, he opens with his Key the door of mercy, by saying: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." The Key, therefore, consists in *the authority given to him by a special revelation*, that even the murderers of the Messiah, could be forgiven, and in *the making known the conditions*, on which that forgiveness could be granted. The other apostles concurred in the employment of this Key, and through Peter it was given to them. For several years it was *the only Key* committed to Peter, and through him to the other apostles, and it was specifically designed for the Jews. But a second Key is to be given. The Gentiles are to have part in this salvation, but the first Key does not meet the provision necessary to extend it unto them. It embraces, in-

---

The latter, may be said to be declarative, the penitent and believing are assured of the kingdom of heaven, the impenitent and unbelieving are as certainly assured of exclusion.

deed, the same conditions, that are found in the second Key, but *lacks the authority* to open the door to the Gentiles. The first, required a special revelation ; the second demands the same. Hence, as Peter was designed to become the instrument, *another Key* must be given to him, to open to the Gentiles, the door of salvation. The manner in which this Key was given, is presented in detail, in Acts 10, and we find that, by special revelation, the authority was given, to engraft the Gentiles. As soon as the Key was thus committed to Peter, he used it, God endorsing it by the gifts of the Spirit, and the other apostles, after hearing Peter's report, and finding it to agree with God's word, cordially received it, and afterward faithfully employed it. In virtue of its being thus granted to Peter, it was, also, without communication with Peter, presented to Paul. Here, then, we have the two Keys, *one designed for the Jews, the other for the Gentiles.* The bestowal of the first was necessary to indicate with absolute certainty, that even the Jews, so guilty, could be saved ; the bestowal of the second was indispensable, since the covenants, promises, &c., belonged to the Jewish nation, and all who were saved must become the seed of Abraham. Passing by the consideration of the phrase "kingdom of heaven," which would unduly swell our article, we may add, this explanation, derived from the history of Peter, clearly teaches the correct sense in which he was the selected instrumentality, rock or foundation upon which the Church is built. Without those Keys, thus given to Peter, both Jews and Gentiles would be debarred ; the former by their awful guilt, the latter by their not being the natural seed of Abraham. Through Peter's instrumentality, both can be saved, for the Keys unlock the door, affording access. Therefore, it is, that whilst other foundations were added, whilst Jesus is the chief corner stone, or the true foundation on which all rests, the promise to Peter is couched in the very language, best adapted to present us with the idea, that to Peter the Church is greatly indebted, and that to him belongs a peculiar, distinguishing pre-eminence. It is a pleasant reflection, that Peter, conscious of this priority in the grace of God, never presumed to plume himself on an honor granted by divine favor. His conduct is in striking contrast to that of his pretended successors.\*

---

\* It has been a matter of astonishment, that in view of the im-

*And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, (lit. in the heavens) : and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven, (lit. in the heavens).*" Without entering into a discussion, respecting the opinions others have entertained concerning this verse, it may be sufficient to say, that whatever is denoted by it, Peter, in this instance, is the recipient of the promise. The question, whether the power of forgiving, or not forgiving sins, of excluding from, or again receiving to, church-fellowship, does not properly belong to the consideration of this passage. It arises from it, but this power possessed by the apostles in common, must be based on Math. 18 : 18, John

---

portance of the subject, and the convictions of the Reformers, the Augsburg Confession passes by the primacy of the Pope, and softly touches the power of the Keys. We must, with Kollner, Niemeyer, D'Aubigne, and others, believe that "the Augsburg Confession had been prepared with the view to give the least possible offence to their opponents." Indeed the confessions of Melanchthon in reply to Luther, Zwingle and others, clearly indicate it. A brief notice of some facts, may, in this connection, be interesting. In the last article, treating of the authority of the bishops, it is said : "We, therefore, teach, that the power of the Keys, or of the bishops, is conformably with the Word of the Lord, a commandment emanating from God, to preach the Gospel, to remit or retain sins, (that is, as they afterward explained, declaratively and not absolutely,) and to administer the sacraments. This power has reference only to eternal goods, is exercised only by the minister of the Word, and does not trouble itself with political administration." After these words were read by Chancellor Brück, and presented to Charles V. there followed the deep-laid intrigues, which led Melanchthon to make those fatal concessions, and write that most remarkable letter to the Cardinal Campegius, the apostolic legate, in which, contrary to his previous writings, and the language of the Confession itself, he says : "We have no doctrine different from that of the Romish Church." : "We are prepared to obey the Romish Church, if with that mildness which she has always manifested toward all men, she will only overlook and yield some little, which we could not now alter if we would." "We reverently pledge obedience to the authority of the Roman Pontiff, and to the entire organization of the Church, only let not the Pope of Rome reject us." "For no other reason do we incur greater hostility in Germany, than because we defend the doctrines of the Romish Church, with the utmost steadfastness." (I have availed myself of Dr. Schmucker's translation of the letter, in Luth. Symbols.) We

20 : 23, &c., for the context and language clearly indicates the meaning. Here, the import is not so plain, owing to the fact, that this additional promise is connected with these Keys, and is given personally to Peter, in view of his possessing or using them. Some think, that the depth of meaning is, by no means, exhausted by what has occurred, or will occur, down to the close of this dispensation, and that it requires the period, when the saints enjoy perfected Redemption, and Peter is seated on his promised throne, to realize the fulness of the promise. One writer, considering its relation to what is still future, frankly says:

---

now know the history of Melanchthon's fears and tears, when under the Imperial and Papal pressure, in self-defence for such humiliation, he afterward asked: "Was it necessary to ask if all Christians are priests, if the primacy of the Pope is of right divine," &c., and then answered, "No! all these things are in the province of the schools, and by no means essential to faith." Luther, not disturbed by the threats and fears that so deeply affected his co-adjutor, seeing and feeling the vital importance of these questions, relating to the claims of the Pope, says: "Satan sees clearly that your Apology has passed lightly over the articles of purgatory, the worship of saints, and, above all, of the Pope and of Antichrist." Bucer, Zwingle and others, coincided with Luther, and refused to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the bishops or Pope. Melanchthon, and those with him, made even greater concessions; they proposed, for the sake of ecclesiastical discipline, to restore to the bishops their jurisdiction, if they would not prosecute them, and to acknowledge of human right, the Pope as supreme bishop. In reference to the Pope, the language was used: "Although the Pope is Antichrist, we may be under his government, as the Jews were under Pharaoh, and in later days under Caiphas." Two prominent men stood firm to the truth. The Chancellor Brück said: "We cannot acknowledge the Pope, because we say he is Antichrist, and because he claims the primacy of divine right." On the day Luther learned of these concessions to bishops and the Pope, he penned five letters, in all of which, he utterly repudiates them as dangerous, and opposed to the truth. Protest after protest effectually crushed them. In all this we say, that whilst the leading Reformers, Luther and Zwingle, and many others, were opposed to yielding anything that would endorse the pretensions of the Papal See, it is also a truth, that Melanchthon, and those with him, were unwilling to give up their own opinions respecting these pretensions and claims, and were only willing, for the sake of peace and

"What, precisely, is the import of this promise to Peter, we know not." After reflecting over the verse and pondering the suggestions of Dr. Knapp, Dr. Kurtz, Dr. Jones, various commentators and others, we confess that this is by far the most difficult portion of the passage. The dogma of the Romanists rests on mere assumption, and the opinions of some of their opposers is pure conjecture. So far as the import may relate to the period of the second Advent we have nothing to say, for we acknowledge our inability to comprehend it, but so far as it relates to this dispensation we may, with a consciousness of our weakness, say, that it appears to us not to relate so much to church discipline as to the action of, or rather the result following the use, of the Keys. Keeping in view how, as Lightfoot, Wetstein and commentators generally inform us, the Syriac, Chaldaic and Rabbinical writers employed the words "binding and loosing," to signify a "forbidding and allowing," we may admit the explanation afforded by some, viz: that whatsoever Peter forbid or allowed should be of divine authority, meeting the divine approbation and ratification. Now in observing the action of these keys, we notice that to the Jews and Gentiles they, on a divine

---

security, to concede a primacy and supremacy to the Pope, grounded on human right, expediency, and ecclesiastical discipline. This is seen from the language still used by them respecting the Pope. Did Melanchthon truly believe, that the Pope would so far humble himself, as to accept a supremacy thus accorded? It appears so; and yet it is difficult to reconcile this with the knowledge he had of the Papacy, unless we consider, that the intrigues and hopes held out by Papists, influenced him to entertain such a project. I have in my possession, a copy of D'Aubigne's *His. of Ref.*, once belonging to the lamented Dr. E. Keller. It is interspersed with remarks, in pencil marks, made by his own hand, and signed by his initials. In vol. 4, p. 196, where the author notices the silence of the Confession on the divine right of the Pope, &c., and expresses the opinion, that "If the Reformation, instead of all this circumspection, had advanced with courage, had wholly unveiled the Word of God, and had made an energetic appeal to the sympathies of reform then spread in men's hearts, would it not have taken a stronger and more honorable position, and would it not have secured more extensive conquests?" Dr. Keller appends that brief, favorite and emphatic note: "No doubt—E. K." The lack of an article directly on the primacy and supremacy of the Pope, has always been regarded by me as a serious defect.

authority personified, or represented, in Peter by the gift of the Spirit, imposed certain conditions and these were insisted on as a prerequisite for admittance into the kingdom of heaven. These Keys thus became "a savor of life or of death," yea more, even those accepting their aid, place themselves under obligations to accept all that Peter announces to be necessary unto salvation, and that whatever may be the result of Peter's announcements or commands in the deliverance or condemnation of men, the same will be ratified by God. That result, whatever it may be, will be known and manifested in the coming kingdom of Christ. We may therefore take leave of this verse with the remark, that in whatever light we may regard it, whether directly teaching the power contained in the Keys, or the result obtained by their use, or both, it appears conclusive that if the preceding explanation of the Keys is the correct one, no exposition would be given it, which will make it contradictory to those Keys or that will, so far as church discipline is concerned, give Peter a power above that possessed by the other apostles.\*

We learn that a primacy is therefore to be accorded to the apostle Peter, not indeed such as the Popes have claimed, but one that gives him the decided precedence of first obtaining and using the Keys. This honor of being thus first selected to present the knowledge of salvation to

---

\* It may be allowed, in a foot note, to add, that in view of the ancients having their doors, &c., closed with bands, and not with locks like ours, and, that consequently, as writers inform us, (Ency. R. Knowl. Art. Keys,) the Key was used to loosen, or fasten, or bind these bands in a peculiar manner, it has occurred to the writer, that this loosening or fastening, according to the use made of Keys, is only applicable to the Keys. If so, then knowing from the fulfillment what the Keys are, we are at no loss to comprehend the meaning of loosening and binding. In the text, however, its meaning is extended somewhat beyond this, as a sort of compromise between the extreme opinions on the subject. Taking the Rabbinical idea of binding and loosening, we must attach to these words the notion of a decision, making something lawful or unlawful. I very much admire Bengel's (Gnomon) view: "By the expression therefore of binding and loosing are comprehended all those things which Peter performed, in virtue of the name of Jesus Christ, and through faith in that name, by his apostolical authority," &c.

both Jews and Gentiles and of having it bestowed by special revelations, is not transferable to others. We may admit that these Keys were successfully employed by others, but we cannot admit that this honor belongs equally to all. Peter is distinguished from all others, by this pre-eminence being given to him, and, whilst it did not authorize him to lord it over the flock, or over the rest of his brethren, it did give him the authority to open the door of salvation to Jew and Gentile, and thus teach all others that his declarations could be safely followed, since he was clothed with divine authority. In this sense also the Church is built upon him, for it is through his instrumentality that the way for gathering out a true seed of Abraham is made plain. It is singular to notice, that whatever may have been the views entertained, all freely confess that the language of Christ, in some way, indicates a superiority of some kind over the rest. The Fathers impressed by this language gave many names to Peter indicative of this, such as the first, greater, prince, head, president, &c., and later writers, equally influenced, award to him a pre-eminence and chiefly name him "the first Apostle." Whilst all feel and acknowledge that a primacy is due to Peter, some place it in the bestowal of the Keys as we have explained it; others in the reception of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; some in personal worth or merit; others in the desire to preserve order or unity; some, in the age of the apostle; others, in the representation of a tendency of the gospel, &c. We leave the reader to jndge, from the language addressed to Peter, the prevailing impression that some kind of a primacy is intended, and from the appeal we have made to the history of Peter, which view best accords with the promise and actual fulfilment. Having said that the primacy we advocate is not transferable, we may, for fear of being misunderstood, be allowed to add: These Keys were, after Peter had used them, given to others, but the honor of receiving them, making them known and first using them belongs to Peter. It is an honor of a personal nature,—a personal privilege accorded, which belongs exclusively to him and is extinguished in him. They could not all be the first one, nor were the Keys given to all at the same time. Peter is purposely selected to receive them and in being thus chosen, he is honored beyond the other apostles. It therefore belongs to him personally and cannot be transmitted or transferred, but will remain his, now and forever.

The question has been agitated from the days of the Fathers until the present time, why it is that Peter is thus distinguished from the other apostles and selected in preference to others in the reception of the Keys. Some attribute it to characteristics, previously exhibited by Peter; others to the confession of his faith, etc. Considering the failings of Peter and his character in contrast with John's or Paul's, it becomes a matter of great difficulty to answer the question. We know not what reasons influenced the mind of the divine Master, and for aught we know, the selection was not dependent on anything that Peter possessed or had done. The explanation given by Chrysostom is the one most generally entertained: "Peter had his name from a rock, because he first merited to found the church by firmness of faith." But this is open to the objection, that in no sense did he merit by what he had previously received as a gift from the heavenly father. The sovereignty of God is displayed in the choice, and how far that was affected by anything in Peter is mere conjecture. As to the bestowal of the name rock, the reason assigned by Ambrose or some ancient homilist, quoted by Barrow, is the best that can be given: "He is called a rock, because he first did lay in the nations the foundations of faith," for as Tertullian says: "The event sheweth the Church was built on him, that is, by him; he did initiate the Key; see which, 'ye men of Israel hear these words, etc."

The explanation that we have given of the Keys enables us to receive both the eulogies, that the Fathers heaped on Peter, and their representations, that all the apostles and even all ministers or bishops likewise possessed these Keys. Whilst many of them allowed to Peter the honor, as history attested, of first receiving and using them and that for this he is deserving of special respect, they also insisted, that this gave Peter no power or jurisdiction over the other apostles, and that these Keys were given to all ministers. A few quotations out of the abundance, cited by Barrow, will serve to illustrate this.

Chrysostom, allowing that all have the Keys, says of Peter: "Although John, although James, although Paul, although any other, whoever may appear performing great matters; he yet doth surpass them all, who did precede them in liberty of speech, and opened the entrance, and gave to them, as to a river carried with a huge stream, to enter with great ease, etc." Optatus says: "He did alone receive the

Keys of the kingdom of heaven to be communicated to the rest." Theophylact declares: "Although it be spoken to Peter alone, *I will give thee*, yet it is given to all the apostles." Ambrose writes: "All we ministers have in St. Peter received the Keys of the kingdom of heaven." Such testimony, in view of the tendencies of the writers, may not indeed be of great value, yet, in view of the age in which they lived, an age when strenuous efforts were made to exalt the bishops and organize a hierarchy, it is valuable, because it shows that, as numerous other writers testify, even Jerome among them, the interpretation of the passage, received from the earlier Fathers and the plain tenor of the language, could not be readily overthrown or removed. The struggles that had already taken place respecting the parity of ministers had not caused them to reject the plain meaning and it was only when the Bishop of Rome was in danger of losing a primacy, based on expediency, civil intervention and the greatness or majesty of the city occupied by him, that another interpretation, utterly antagonistic to the text, history and analogy of practice in the church, was introduced. In opposition to this Gelasian and Hildebrandine interpretation various solutions were sought out, but all of them, more or less, in sympathy with the utterances of the earlier Fathers, for they all agreed that the power, exercised by Peter, was also manifested in the other apostles and that whatever precedence must be conceded to Peter, it did not confer an exclusive jurisdiction or remove an equality of power among the apostles. We may therefore close this article by saying, that such has been the progress of exegesis, the critical investigations of the Fathers, the advance of events in the Romanist and Protestant churches, that we are no longer required to resist theses like Tetzel's or Eck's, or the more authoritative utterance of a Florentine and Lateran Council. These latter, whilst unrepealed, are, by the necessities of the case, superseded by a more moderate estimate of the power of the Keys. Even this estimate is alike opposed to the promise and the fulfillment of it in Peter's experience, and becomes more and more weakened in the minds of many, now its professed supporters, as they investigate its proposed connection with this passage. The recent events in Italy, Austria, Spain etc., indicate that the interpretations of the Fathers and of Protestants are contrasted with the Gelasian hypothesis.

### ARTICLE III.

#### THE WILL.

By Rev. ALLEN TRAVER, A. M., Andover, N. Y.

The personal, active and self-acting soul of man, is endowed with a power which is designated the Will, in distinction from its other powers. This is, also, one of the chief elements that distinguishes us from the brute creation. An appropriate object presents itself to our consideration, and after deliberation there must be a choice made. The soul has the capacity for determining to seek the object for which there is an inducement. It also has the power of rejecting an inducement and turning aside from the solicitation, and making an opposite, the object of choice. Man is what he is, and cannot be otherwise than man, because he is endowed with the power of choice.

The worth of the human soul cannot be fully measured, unless we take a full view of the Will and point out its distinct prerogatives, and consider its elemental position and integral office in the soul. The capacity for a broader range of effort and a higher style of activity in the earth than belongs to the brute creatures, is a leading characteristic of human nature. The power of discerning between a right and a wrong action is a necessary attribute of rational and intelligent beings. The power of choosing between two courses of action; between right and wrong; good and evil, the Will, as a constituent of the spirit, exalts him above all nature and creatures. Hence we must consider the nature, the office and the workings of the Will, as a fixed truth, from which there is no escape, and in view of which we are responsible.

I enter on the consideration of this subject with a conviction, that there is not only a Will power in man, but that it is free from the restraints of natural law, in its ordinary action within its own sphere; and that we are fearfully responsible in view of the gift. It will not do for us, endowed with reason, to say that the Will is simply another name for the power exerted over the mind by sensa-

tions and ideas, and that as these, or their combinations, are strong or weak, external action, under their influence, does, or does not take place. We say that reason is the man himself, in action or the attitude of thought; and that emotion or sensation, whatever may be the nature of that emotion, is the man himself feeling. The Will is an agent not outside of man, but an agent in the sense of the man himself, determining by an actual choice, selecting, between two or more objects, truths, or courses of action. There is a power, in the nature of man, by which we are enabled to determine. This we call the Will. It is believed that we sustain certain relations to law; and government; and duty; and God, and to one another. No one denies these positions, no one attempts to prove them. They are the instinctive belief of the race. Unless there is a free natural, moral Will, there cannot be in any legitimate sense, sin, or wrong, or evil desert in the system. Deny this, and we can ignore all the natural and instinctive and actual distinctions between moral and natural evil, and right and wrong, and treat sin as we would a wounded or diseased limb. The sense of right and wrong are deeper in the human soul than to allow of eradication. The Will is that power, by which we choose between the right and the wrong; the good and the evil.

In the attainment of knowledge, or in feeling, there are certain exercises put forth. When we will, we put forth energy quite different. All our emotions and judgments, while they spring from the same central nature and personality that the Will does, in its choices, are quite the reverse of choosing by the means of the free Will. But when there are two objects presented for our consideration, we cannot avoid the act of choice between them, if we would move forward in the discharge of the duties resting on us in the period of trial here. If we open the eye on a beautiful landscape, we cannot help beholding it. When the eye is open there is no alternative but to see it. But will you open the eye, or keep it closed, is a question for you to decide. There must be a choice and determination of the Will.

Suppose that you propose, in view of securing some worthy end, some object highly desirable and good, to journey to a distant part of the State. You also consider the best mode of travel. You compare and balance the facts, which are elicited in the prosecution of the inquiry.

On the whole, you propose to go in your own private carriage. You consider that you can journey leisurely and at your own will. You can rest in the heat of the day. You can have a better view of the country, and can gain a knowledge of its marked features, and notice the peculiarities of that portion which is most highly improved. You are not forced to travel when storms prevail. You are free from the risks of collisions. These facts are influential in forming a conclusion, and you choose, you elect to secure the object before you, which you cannot do without the visit. It is noble and worthy and you resolve on its attainment. Furthermore, you decide on the mode, in view of the agreeable and home-like mode and because of adaptation to incidental or secondary desires and ends. Before you start, there must be the attitude of the Will in determination to travel in the way in which you do. There may be inducements of an opposite nature held out to the mind. There may be ideas, motives, incentives, emotions, promptings in the opposite direction and for another object. But they are not the prevailing ones, for you determine in view of the former. This is what is meant by the mental act of willing and that, by which this choice is made, we denominate the Will.

We may feel within the sinful heart the risings of envy, hatred, revenge of a burning malice and a desire to secure some object, and these become incitements to fearful crimes. But before there can be actual murder, and the real guilt of the crime, there must be a determination to it. All the malicious and passionate burnings in the soul, constitute the man a murderer in disposition, though not in act. When ever there is a wrong perpetrated, there is a moment, as the wrong doer well realizes, when he yields to the evil motive and inducement to the horrid crime, nay, more when he determines positively to commit the crime. But man is not a machine, who must yield to ideas, sensations and motives, but he can rise superior to these and chain them to their place, whether good or evil and act in accordance with the remotest opposite. Again suppose that I feel the cravings of hunger, or thirst or some other desire. These desires are unavoidable, as we are well assured. There is this want of the animal system. But as the result of a disease that is preying on me and also from certain drugs that have been administered by my physician,

medicinally, it may not be proper or good for me to receive water and, therefore, I determine to abstain. I have a will power, moved by motives, which rises triumphant over my mere animal longing, my burning thirst or growing hunger, and it prevails in view of what seems a higher good than mere bodily want. "I am conscious, in my spiritual being of the possession of a supernatural agency. When appetite craves, in weaker or stronger measures, I can see in my spiritual being another law than highest happiness and I feel the claim of spiritual worthiness; and I can put this over upon the weaker appetite against the stronger, or over against all appetite that is in collision with it, and I have in this an alternative in kind to all that nature may present; and a spring to throw myself against nature, and work my way upward in resistance of it. The desires of flesh may be aroused to their utmost passionate excitement, and all circumstances may favor their indulgence; prudential considerations may seem to lie on some side, and even the promptings of kindness may also concur; and thus the unbroken current of nature may tend towards gratification; but if I also see, that such indulgence would degrade and debase my spirit; I shall, in this claim of my rational being, have a full alternative to all of nature's promptings. Let constitutional nature do her best or her worst, I may still stand in my spiritual integrity, regardless of either the happiness or the suffering that weighs itself against duty. There is in this capacity of the spirit, that which is out of, and above, nature; a determiner when gratification may be, and when it may not be with honor to the soul; and in the alternative of worthiness to happiness, thus opened, no alluring temptation from constitutional nature can ever come upon man and be truly unavoidable. It is the right of the spirit to control and use the sense for its own highest excellency; and it is due to itself to put the flesh to any sacrifice or endurance which may preserve or exalt its own true dignity; and thus in its own behalf, the spirit may contain all enjoyment and all suffering that nature can give."\*

Man, having this free Will is able to receive or reject certain ends of action. He is also able to act in accordance with the promptings of certain motives. Inducements are set before us and draw the mind and heart to them. They are held out as incentives to exertion, and

---

\* Hickok's *Science of the Mind*, p. 269—70.

as springs of action. There are also motives that propel. One is in advance and holds out a glittering crown, as a reward to the one that seeks, to the desiring spirit. The other reaches us from a different position and propels, and urges us, as with a thong. It says virtually fly to the refuge, as did the angel who visited Lot and his family, when they were out of the city. When a certain end has been made the subject of this election, this choice by the Will, that object may next in order become the permanent choice. Without any wavering we place ourselves in harmony with all that is included in that end. We also assume an attitude of indifference or opposition to all that is good or evil, as the determination of the mind may be.

Having considered the Nature of the Will, the second inquiry that arises is in reference to its Freedom. The doctrine of Fatalism and of Chance have been forcibly advocated and if we admit the premises of their advocates, we must endorse their conclusions. But the range of their influence is limited, from the fact that neither seems to commend itself to the reason, or the common consciousness of mankind. The Greek tragedians seemed to receive the doctrine of fatalism, for in their splendid creations fate seems as a strong muscular chord, running through all the parts from end to end. Their views and conceptions on this subject, were of a tragic, dark and gloomy and awful kind. They represent it as irresistible, and terrible as death. It was a remorseless power swaying gods and men, and was not only man's most dreaded enemy, but a terror to the gods, as it was merciless and uncompromising when they were involved in its movements. It could not be propitiated either by prayer or sacrifice; neither did it give nor receive favor. When the elements subdued, and tramped on man and wrought his destruction, this was a manifestation of fate. In the rolling away of the years of man's life, thus diminishing his opportunities; in the calamities and sorrows and misfortunes of our troubled life; and in the events of death, and the dread of the future, paralyzing courage as a human virtue, and faith as an act of purity, there were seen the movements of fate, which could be stayed, neither by man, nor the gods. The immortals were as thoroughly subjected to its power from the position which they held as gods, as were feeble and dependent men. He who is consistent in his fatalism, cutting off his relations to an authoritative being, and disregarding the future,

only as that is unfolded in the web of a real but blind fatality, cannot be refuted by argument. He differs from his opponents in most of the important points involved in the problem of life. He allows no starting point; grants no principle; and he concedes no premise. He disputes even the reality of moral distinctions, if it is a principle at war with his scheme. Hence logic cannot drive him from his position. Receive his theory, and the disorders of the moral world, he assures you, are accounted for and explained. He reasons as follows: Nature exhibits to us a flow of events, rapid and connected in succession. They are as fated as are mechanical necessities. The present comes up from the past. The future is construed from the present, and there are invariable results. Each point is a force. Each force is an element of advancement, a moving power in the stream, caused and causing in turn. It is first pressed and then presses. The stream of nature moves on with force and power, and bears on its bosom, in the same resistless swell, drift wood, lingering at times in quiet waters, and again floating on the surface in sportive freedom, and then swept on by the same irresistible causal power, to ends which are fixed and unchangeable in all their accidents. Nature knows nothing beyond the sweep of her own vast compass. She draws all things into the current of her ceaseless flow, and only affords an explanation of them, when seen in their relations which are fixed in a chain of necessity.

The fatalist, further, avers that man is a part of the chain; individuals are the separate, yet connected links; or that man is a parasite on the earth, and is somewhat as is the soil, and the various surroundings of life, as education, and the favorable or the unfavorable circumstances of his being. In the external world, the laws and the connections are those of necessity. But the comparisons which are drawn from them are inadequate to explain the nature and operations of the human will, and they are quite antagonistic when arrayed by the side of those that are moral and spiritual and under the direction of providence. A comparison, instituted between the two for illustration, fails to enlighten, and must necessarily mislead us in our discussions on the subject of freedom.

This absolute and universal conception or idea of physical and intellectual causation, denying will-power, if admitted, will eat into and vitiate the force of our philoso-

phy of freedom, and we shall not find in time or place, a position or barrier, which we can make good against it. As we grope our way backward, along the line of history and recorded events, we seek some ultimate point, some grand and infinite fountain, from which universe proceeded, created by an Almighty power. If at every point we find the same facts and conditions, force pressed and pressing, cause before and behind and all precisely analogous to every other point in the dreary waste of causation, we shall find no place to begin or end our inquiries, and our weariness will be our only solace.

Fatalism is a word which gives us no account of events in their origin or destiny, but only their fatal succession, as they transpire in the world's history. It is a subjective idea, or rather notion, and void of vitality, for it assigns no cause for the order of the universe. It makes nature cold and cheerless and remorseless. Every single and simple effect; every phenomenon in all its various combinations must have a cause that is adequate in the Divine will, and along the line of events there must be secondary agencies or causes, or we deny a good, wise and powerful Providence.

When man reduces himself by such a theory, or narrow speculation, to the idea that he is a being who is a joint in nature and merely a natural force, he destroys himself as a personality, and loses the original conception of his free, personal, spiritual agency. He is no longer a creature of self-guiding action, with reason looking before and after. His freedom is denied and he is void of consistency and lives without aim or purpose, and if he admits the existence of God, makes Him only the first link in the chain of nature, and in the system of the universe.

But there are higher analogies and profounder reasonings, which indicate Freedom of Will, in opposition to blind fatalism. He who can reason, must be somewhat like Him who made the reasoning being. He must live in a certain sense, the image of God within him. If we have no freedom, can we assert that we are the creatures made by a free being? When we deny our own freedom, on the ground of the impossibility of the conception, that moment we deny it to God, and earth and heaven sink into the stream of a blind succession, without origin, or end, without a head, or termination. Thus there is nothing above nature; no supernatural; and man is a creature who

drifts, ebbs and flows in a drifting, shoreless universe. Chance, on the other hand is mere fortune or accident. It cuts asunder the laws and ordinances which are necessary in the constitution of relations, and the universe becomes a rope of sand, and disconnected particles and parts. It loosens every bond. It denies certainty and order, and is far less reasonable than sheer fatalism. "Every effect, every phenomenon and combination of phenomenon, must have its cause, and that not only in its parts, but as a whole. Fate or chance are mere words, and give no account of the combinations. They are inadequate, in any sense they can bear, to be causes of the order of the universe. They are so repugnant to common reason and so manifestly insufficient, that the untutored mind instinctively rejects them, and the most competent thinkers will dismiss them from consideration with a brief remark. They can impose upon none but the half-wits."

The ideas of fatalism and chance having been considered, we proceed to notice the principle, that there is freedom of Will, and that a free will in action, must stand between these two. There are laws of mind, most unquestionably, and the mind acts in harmony with them. These laws are certain, and the soul is indissolubly connected with them. Under them the mind acts freely, and with a large range of liberty. The Will acts freely and orderly, uncontrolled, and self-controlling, affected, yet unconstrained, only by the force of motives. The chain of necessity in nature, composed of links well-connected, bind not in this department of creation. The conception which we have of Will; of freedom of the Will; and yet of this free-will under law, can never be fully explained, and neither can or should it render itself a subject of logical criticism. No explanation can be furnished which will harmonize its parts to the mind of man. A process of the reason in logical forms, can only proceed along the links of fixed relations in nature, and only move in this stream. The soul of man, the free-will cannot be sunk into this stream. Our explanations cannot be satisfactory, when they destroy our conceptions, based on centuries of abstraction and study, or when they lead us to throw away with one hand what we have gathered with the other. A free-will is supernatural in some sense, and is above and beyond the flow of nature, and does not share in its necessity. Hence, no explanation which is of nature, and shares in its rigid

and unvarying necessity, can be regarded as adapted to this problem. The spiritual man must rise above natural laws. Freedom of Will consists in this, that, though subject to mental law, in accordance with which it acts, it can at any moment, by an internal self-determining power, begin a new ideal train of mental operations; or it can at pleasure interfere with the sequence of things which are passing in our experience. In saying this, I do not decide how far nature or mental law influences us, or we exert an influence on them.

Man is not free, if he is not the author of his own actions. If that which occurs in the will, and the consequent action is not brought to pass by himself, but is produced by some power out of himself, which uses him as a passive instrument, then as all the defenders of human liberty agree in maintaining, he is not a free being. But what constitutes the free authorship of action? Capacity for locomotion is not the power of producing action, which constitutes freedom, for inanimate bodies have the capacity for movement. But they are as passive in one sense, when in action, as they are when at rest.

There is secondly, in animals a principle through which outward movements may be produced, but they are not accounted responsible for them, as we are for our voluntary actions. There may be mental phenomena unaccompanied by responsible action. A brute, or an insane man may have the same perceptions that a sane man has. There is a form of perception, and memory, and passion, and affection in dreaming, without the shadow of responsibility. Even brutes consider, as well as man, before they act. A dog eyes a leg of mutton in the market, before he seizes it. Appetite moves him, but he is not a responsible author of his own actions, as man is.

His actions arise from his animal, and not from a rational constitution, and are the result of his nature, which is without reason. Therefore, we infer, that capacity for action and determination do not involve responsibility. An insane man may be impressed with the idea of the duty, as well as with the desire to kill a man, and may do so very deliberately. Yet he is not held responsible. But, when a sane man, having the power to give to facts and motives their proper weight, and consideration, and influence, performs the same action, we charge him with the crime of murder, for we say he has reason, and committed the deed deliberately.

The horse, and the domestic animals also judge, but they are unconscious of laws, by which they are governed. The horse, if he reasons, as some suppose, cannot "see reason." He has only the mind of sense, for the groom, the saddle, and the provender. But man reasons, and he sees reason in things, and in the freedom of his purposes and choices, he is responsible. "Men are called rational, because the ideas of their reason are a conscious possession. Their laws of action are not imposed on them by their constitution, and carried into effect by their nature. They are rather set before them to choose." We act from deliberation, not instinct, or impulse, and because it is reasonable. We act not blindly, but we are convinced and persuaded by motives and inducements set before us, and applied to reason. In explaining this fact further, it may be said that to act from right reason, is to act after proposing a reason to the mind, as a motive. Consciously to do good to a fellow creature, because this is the law of God, supposes, first, a recognition of the law as binding. Secondly, it supposes submission to it, as a motive that binds the conscience and heart. Creatures that do not recognize the reason as law to them, cannot yield to law as a reason, nor refuse obedience to the force of instinct, as a law of their nature. We are conscious that certain acts are evil, and others are good. By this element in our nature, we know ourselves; our actions; our mental laws leading to them; our motives; and we put ourselves under these laws and motives. Thus we are the authors of our own actions, and, therefore, we are responsible. We are not only under the influence of motives, but we choose them. When we obey God, we choose the motives connected with his being and nature, and with all the workings of his providence. When we follow evil, we reject the motives and principles which have a connection with God's character and ways, and we seek to follow those that are evil and lower in their nature, and range and character. The cause of certain motives being our motives, is in ourselves, and not in the motives. It may be said that men err in judgment. But they do determine in view of motives. Moral approbation, or disapprobation, are awarded us for our motives, despite our fallibility of judgment. While brutes move from desire, man has his reason intervening. Rational beings can separate themselves from objects, and can consider relations, and can choose self-denial,

or self-gratification. But objects act on a creature of sense, according to laws of its nature, but with man, reason intervenes. And man governs himself by the resultant motive of his determination, after a choice between motives that are very different in their character.

We determine our motives, hence, we originate our actions. And this is the true conception of human freedom, viz.: That we have the power to determine our motives; and that we determine ourselves by our motives. Despite of our fallibility of judgment, if we carefully seek we will be excused for error, even where more powerful minds were correct in their decisions. Faithful endeavors will be regarded by Him who searches the heart.

The power of choosing between two or more courses of action, between right and wrong, good and evil the Will as a constituent in the spirit, exalts him above all nature and creatures, and constitutes his responsibility.

We have seen that the Will may be defined as "the capacity for electing," though we may not be able to give a complete explanation of the conception. But it is a definition which justifies itself to the consciousness of man.

There are other considerations, which show that this conception of freedom, agrees with fact. There are certain modes of education, which imply it. Children may be educated like animals, but animals cannot be educated like children. The Arab makes his horse kind and affectionate, by kindness. Severity will subdue the vicious propensities of some. Pain may be associated with certain habits, so as to prevent the brute from falling into them, and they may be improved by keeping from them whatever tends to develop and excite their passions. Thus we educate creatures, and make them subservient to our good. We use kindness, or severity in turn, and seek the development of useful qualities, by restraint on their passions, and by eradicating malicious feelings, as far as we can. But children, while we educate, and instruct, and drill them, can at the same time have a motive developed in the soul. They can be taught to make the cultivation of a good disposition, and proper feelings, as an object of value and service to themselves. While the brute may know, and be kind and obedient to his master, he cannot undertake to produce in himself benevolence, as an habitual temper of mind. The state of creature mind, cannot

be parted from the creature, as it is nature, distinct from man ; and a mental state made an end of the highest worthiness. They cannot seek the abstract quality, but a child can direct attention to the cultivation of a good disposition, which implies freedom. A brute is not sensible of the constraints caused by the necessity of its nature, and which it obeys. Hence, it does not experience the want of liberty, as one born blind has not the idea of darkness, because he has not that of light. In order to know the privation of darkness, he must have enjoyed the preception of light.

Hence, every analysis of self-consciousness points, to a region which the pretended endless concatenation of blind causes and effects does not reach, and where quite other laws, than the so-called laws of nature prevail, and where a much higher life, the life of the soul unfolds *ad infinitum*, and in the repetition, beholds and recognizes itself. "So far from any thing like that necessary and indiscerpible sequence of interlaced phenomenon, it is on the sole condition of that sequence being interrupted, that consciousness arises, and, on the other hand, this disappears in the exact proportion, as that appears or becomes predominant." Further, that the soul remains conscious of its identity, amid the current of things, and the incessant change of outward phenomenon, and inward states, explains, as no other supposition does, that there is something in the soul which does not belong among these phenomena, and is not subject to their laws, the character of which laws consists in an incessant progression, from the conditioning, to the conditioned—whilst from the consciousness of identity, a something constant is required, which, instead of being borne along by the current, can stem it, or look down upon it from a secure elevation.

What, but the free Will, can render the mind requisite for speculative inquiry ? What renders this possible, except that the soul can arbitrarily step out of the perpetually advancing phenomena of external and internal life, and, in the midst of the thread of change, return continually to that which is constant, and elevate itself to that one and last, which never occurs in the stream of sequences, as one of them, but which can be apprehended only by a free introversion of the soul.

The mind could never come into possession of the highest forms of knowledge, by speculation, but would always

remain sunk in the dim perception of sensible objects, and thus be dragged along with material things, which are in a continual flow, and reflow, if it stood under the same laws of natural causality, as things do. There would exist continuance for the mind, without the dawn of things—there would be only eternity, without the dawnings of time. If the human Will is once introduced as a link in the brazen chain, there is no escape for man in the circuit of nature.

Only he who is free can tear himself loose from nature's chain of adamant, and distinguish himself from things. If we consider the phenomena of the physical world, as addressed to the senses, they appear to form an uninterrupted chain, whose links mutually determine each other. They present an interminable, and strictly connected chain of cause and effect, which to all human appearance, is woven into a thread and web, which cannot be broken. But the mind of man, after having, for a time, wearied itself, in the endless succession of visible things, by observing the order and combination of nature, never fails at length to reach a conception, which cannot be included in the experience, and the movements of nature, in all her varied phenomena; nor can it, by any means, be brought into the same rank with matter and sense, and with the ordinances of pure natural law. Liberty is an idea, originally implanted in the soul. Man is incapable of arbitrarily ridding himself of this idea. And we do not mean that each person possesses it in clear and distinct consciousness, though its germ exists in all; since the ideas and conceptions of the ideal, are either entirely misunderstood, or faintly conceived by many in whom real, valid and manifest soul-life, is dimly seen, and faintly developed. They have but little mental growth, and low conceptions of the perfection at which men should aim. In the first dawnings of consciousness, this idea of liberty shines and glows as a practical truth. The soul finds itself a self-acting principle, and finds Will an essential in its existence, and spontaneously acting. Man cannot well imagine himself, as not willing. And through all its active stages to the last analysis of thought and reason, this is found as a living conception and conviction.

The presence of this idea in all our experience, is the pledge of its existence and life, and of a sphere of action, above the apparently indiscernible connection of a mo-

tion or result, produced by necessary law. Liberty belongs to the very nature of the soul of man. And in like manner the ideas of God, and of immortality, make themselves felt, with a high form of urgency, and they dwell, as we find, in the soul, with an unextinguishable, and it may be, with an unexplained and unintelligible efficacy. And it is one of the main problems of philosophy, to trace these higher indications of life, peculiar to the soul, and to bring them, active and influential as truth, to a distinct consciousness. The idea of liberty becomes more intense by reflection upon the phenomena of the external world, of matter, and the internal world of the spirit, as they are naturally adapted to each other. As we consider the facts, which appear, we are led back by induction, to the beginning of time and events, which originated in something, and by a Power not found in the various phenomena of nature.

Again, as we reflect on our internal intellectual, moral, and spiritual nature and life, we can find rest only in the idea of moral liberty, and we accept it as one of the ultimate facts of the created universe. But it does not follow from this, that the idea of liberty was not in the mind, prior to reflection; or that it was invented by reflective processes, in order to make both worlds intelligible to man, and to move in harmony. It was present before thought and continued reflection, and independent of purpose. The mind in action cannot rest without the idea of liberty. Only he, who is originally free, will be conscious of the pressure of necessity, when it really exists, as original heat is necessary to make cold sensible.

The self-determination of the Will, belongs so essentially to the spiritual Personality, that the former cannot be taken away, only by virtually annihilating the latter. Without this idea of liberty and freedom, man could not speak of his personal *I*, in the ordinary human and rational sense. In the beginning of consciousness, there is found the pure self-determining Will, free in choice, and, hence, freedom is a part of the essence and nature of the Personality, the conscious *I*.

The Will is exercised and determined from motives, considerations, and judgments. The intellect of man goes before the will with a torch, which is the light of truth. And error is a companion on the way, and too often shapes the action of will to itself. By means of the intellect, we

distinguish various things, plans and objects, and consider inducements and compare them with each other. Thus we are furnished with ideas, and motives, and judgments, which lie before the soul, and out of the number before us the Will chooses and determines to follow some one of them. There is no real and valid action, only as there is intellect, and consciousness, and will involved, and self-activity. For action, under these circumstances, we are responsible, but not for a simple sensation, or feeling, or an impression without will and action arising therefrom. Some form of experience and action may be developed in us, according as is the force of natural instincts, and the dark workings of natural laws, and from the unsounded depths of the soul, as for example, when one has an inexplicable aversion for an object, or a magical inclination to it. But the Will must, as a rule, be voluntarily determined to it, and for this we are amenable, for we exercise our freedom. The consciousness of a real action belongs to the spirit, that thinks, and judges, and cherishes motives, and wills, and exercises the power of self-determination, in view of motives. While the human Will is a distinct power, and puts forth energy, it is not exercised apart from our other faculties and powers, but rather it acts from a blended force and basis, found in them all. "It associates itself with our intellectual decisions, on the one hand, and our emotional attainments on the other, but contains an important element, which cannot be resolved into either the one or the other, or into both combined. The other powers, such as the sensibility, the reason, the conscience, may influence the Will, but they cannot constitute it, nor yield its peculiar workings. We have only by consciousness to look into our own souls, as the Will is working to discover a power, which, though intimately connected with the other attributes of the mind, even as they are closely related to each other, does yet stand out distinctly from them, with its peculiar functions, and its own province."<sup>\*</sup>

While we hold to the freedom of the Will, and to the correlative truth, human responsibility, the Will, as we conceive, is directed in its choices and volitions, and all its wonderful and mysterious actions, by motives. It selects these most freely. "By a motive," says Edwards, "I mean the whole of that which moves, excites, or invites the

---

\* *Vocab. of Philos.*, p. 554.

mind to volition, whether that be one thing singly, or many things conjointly. Many particular things may concur, and unite their strength to induce the mind, and when it is so, all together are as one complex motive. And when I speak of the strongest motive, I have respect to the strength of the whole that operates to produce a particular act of volition, whether that be the strength of one thing alone, or many together." Let it be understood, that the motive does not determine the Will absolutely. But the Will determines in view of the motive. The Will gives strength to the motive. It is the man who makes the motive what it is in strength and power over him, and not the motive the man.

There are laws in, and of the mind, which have a connection with the Will, but they lay no absolute restraint on the Will. This is as obvious, as that there are laws of the reason and consciousness, but they do not trammel these faculties and powers of the soul, in the discovery of what is truth, or what is virtue. In like manner, the soul acts during the period of life, but acts under the circumstances of existences, which surround man.

The wills of all rational and voluntary beings go forth in action, and we see their results. This is a fact no one will question. The deeds of man are the record of history in all time, countries and nations. But what causes the determinations of all these minds now existing, and that have existed, and that shall exist, in their choices. Can we declare truthfully and philosophically, "Nothing whatever?"

The Will is free. There is the power of contrary choice. The Will chooses. But is it an absolute determination, independent, and alone and solitary, or is there another element which enters into the sphere of consideration, which becomes part of the drama? There are motives which have influence and power in every particular volition. There are conditions under which the Will acts. These conditions are a part of the power. Hence, can we aver, that the Will is a power absolute, or is there not one or more factors in the problem? The Will is the efficient cause, but there are other and important facts which come in as motives, inducements and reasons. An efficient cause; an adequate cause; and an absolute cause, are by no means identical. The idea of cause, is simple in one respect. But in another it is very complex, for there are

varied circumstances and contingencies, without which the human will never acts. The relation of cause and effect is complicated, as is evident when we consider the complex frame and arrangements of the universe. It may seem simpler in man, in the soul, and yet it is as mysterious, and as wonderful, and as marked, as in nature.

As soon as man begins to think on the subject of Will, and has the idea and conception of its freedom, he launches beyond it in thought. Motives and inducements are the point to which he moves, from the necessity of the reason. There is a relation between these. There is another point, and that is the relation, as a fact. But this is beyond the solvent powers of the chemistry of human thought. It is an element, and has not been analyzed, and never will be, as we conceive.

There is the Thesis of Will; there is the Antithesis; there is the Mesothesis. Who of man can determine the one, without the other? Who can solve either of the triad? Who can determine their relations? This is God's secret. Who dare attempt to step in, where angels fear to tread? Put off thy shoes, for the place, if not holy, is far beyond the measure of thy line.

We have seen that the mind is self-acting, and that the Will, as an element of the soul, is in a large sense, also, self-acting, and a power and a law in itself. This is one of the conditions of responsibility. While circumstances influence us, we are, as free agents, accountable, from the fact, that we can entertain an intelligent view of duty and right, under a wide variety of circumstances. The conscience, also, comes in as a guide and monitor in securing a choice of the Will. This declares between right and wrong, and its dictum is authoritative in its utterances. The use and activity of the Will, is always in connection with the reason, and the degree of intelligence to which we have attained, and the conscience. While they are separate, one principle and one life pervade them. There is spontaneous thought, moral conviction, and free and voluntary choice. The clearer our moral convictions are, and the more distinct and all-pervading our thinking, the higher and more vigorous will be the Will's action. So intimate are reason, will, and conscience, that we may affirm that they are the prevailing consciousness of man; the sublime and simple personal idea which omnipotently sways the individual, and inspires the life. They are the moving of

spirit and feelings, and hold man in happy concord to right and truth and God; or swing him over in commitment to all evil.

In this Will there is natural freedom, and spontaneous action. But there is, also, a close and intimate connection with moral and spiritual law; moral obligation and rights. It is morally free, yet it moves under the impulse of warm desires and inclinations, emotions and passions, with attachment to the central personality.

Dr. McCosh, in speaking of the self-acting will, and conscience, and intelligence, as evinced in the moral nature of man, says: "These three, then, seem to be the essential elements, or conditions of responsibility. Every human being, in a sane state of mind, is in possession of all three. The maniac, in some cases, has lost the first, and has no proper power of will. The idiot, and in some cases the maniac, is without the third, or the power of discovering, what is really embraced in a given phenomenon. Without the one, or the other of these necessary adjuncts, there is no room for the right exercise of the second, that is, the conscience; and the party thereof, is not responsible. In the case of the maniac, as soon as intelligence, and the power of will are restored, the conscience, which is the most indestructible faculty in the human soul, is in circumstances to renew its proper operations."

In view of these considerations, what a wonderful and fearful structure is the spiritual nature of man! To choose, is one of the grand and elevated prerogatives of man. Consider the soul as the real man. What wonderful endowments! What a conception is that of the reasoning and thinking; the willing; and the moral man. There is intelligence to apprehend all the varied kinds of truth, beauty, goodness and purity, which can speak to the soul. There is moral power, and conscience to consider or discriminate between good and evil. There is the power to make choice of the best, and also the fearful alternative to select the very worst of all that can be elected by the Will.

What a fearful endowment then, is that of choice, and what a blessed act and state of the soul, electing the good, and God as its portion, lawgiver and rewarder, and delight. We can run through the vast chain of varied good and evil, from the highest and the best, to the lowest and the vilest, which can be appropriated and enjoyed by man; we have the utterances of the conscience in favor of the

good and enduring; and we have the power of choice for the very best, and we are invited to it, with the loving voice of the Saviour of men. What marvels we are to ourselves, and what subjects of wonder to other beings, in the vast universe. What a high order we are, in the chain of beings! What creature is nearer to God in his nature and endowments than man, and yet what one has fallen so low in sin and misery.

God has endowed us most richly, with powers, and emotions, and sentiments, and with reason that can look before and after, and search for truth and virtue, in all realms of the universe. It was most worthy of the Infinite Author of our being, to create us and endow us, that we might be companions who would freely love Him. With this purpose in view, He gave us minds to understand, and affections to love and appreciate, and a conscience to work moral distinctions, and the Will to choose. Thus He provides for a free decision, by giving us powers that act in liberty, and yet are capable of one or the other, of vice or virtue. Having such a state and nature for free action, and exercising choice, we have that which is most possible in a creature finite in nature and state.

When we have the conception of free-will in the ranges of liberty, and consider its relations to all the other powers, it must elevate our apprehensions of the value and the worth of the soul, and deepen the sense of our responsibility for the good or evil we do, and the characters we form. It will, also, give us a clearer sense of the value of the gospel, in that it gives us new opportunities for choice, and that unembarrassed by the transgressions of the past. It also holds out to us new hopes for the future, undarkened by the effects of present sin.

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

#### REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MINISTERS.

LXXIII.

**JOHN NICHOLAS MARTIN.**

The influence of the Christian ministry is as enduring  
Vol. XX: No. 79. 49

as time itself. It is transmitted from age to age, through successive generations. In moulding thought, in giving permanence to events, it is not to be measured by commemorative words, or official records. The sweet odor still cleaves to the vase, long after the precious ointment has been exhausted. The good man does not live in vain. His name, so talismanic in its influence, with the lapse of time grows brighter and brighter. The principles which he disseminated, the services which he performed, will never be forgotten. His voice may be hushed in death, his course on earth terminated, but the truths which he enunciated, the great service to which his life was devoted, those hours of patient thought and constant toil, are never effaced. They are interwoven and commingled with the history of the Church, and the love of the Church gathers around the tomb, and hallows his memory. But his work is not yet finished. His deeds live on, and the power of his life and character is felt in eternity. Although more than three score years and ten have passed away, since the subject of our present sketch entered upon his rest, his influence is still seen; it has made an indelible impression upon the endless future.

John Nicholas Martin was born in the Dutchy of Deux-Ponts or Zweibrucken in Rhenish Bavaria, and immigrated to North America about the middle of the eighteenth century. He was then a married man with several children, and came to this country in company with a Lutheran colony, who were under the impression that they would find a more congenial home on these shores. They landed in the city of Philadelphia, with the intention of settling permanently on the rich soil of Pennsylvania, but as most of the desirable land, which could be procured, was already occupied, they passed on to the valley of the Shenandoah, whither many of our German emigrants had already been attracted. Some of these settlements extended for a considerable distance from the North into the great central valley of Virginia, and an opening had been made even into North Carolina. The congregation, to which Mr. Martin ministered, after some hesitation and delay, finally determined to locate in Anson county, near the boundary of South Carolina. A very ancient Lutheran church is still found at this point, which was perhaps the scene of his early labors.

Mr. Martin continued to labor, and to watch over the

interests of the settlement for several years, when, with the larger portion of his congregation, he removed to a district between the Broad and Saluda Rivers, in South Carolina, a favorite spot with the Germans of that day in the South. The German population in this region very much increased, and Lutheran churches were established on both of these rivers. Mr. Martin here ministered to two congregations, Zion's church on the South side, and St. Michael's, six miles distant on the North side of the Saluda, both of them colonies from the original church. During his residence here, he visited his native land, the scenes of his childhood and of his early labors. The interests of his church seemed, however, to have been the prominent object of his visit. He returned home with a supply of books and other articles which interested his people. In this position of usefulness he remained for many years, all the time officiating in his vernacular German, it being the language of the pulpit and his household.

We next meet with the subject of our narrative in Charleston, S. C. His official engagement with the Lutheran church there begins with the year 1776. Although invited at that date to assume the regular pastoral charge, it is probable that he with a portion of his original flock had removed thither at an earlier period. This was his last field of labor. Many reminiscences of his life and services, his sacrifices and toils, during this eventful period of our country's history, are still preserved. The old church, in which he preached, is still remembered, an antiquated building of a peculiar construction, resembling some of the ancient churches in the rural districts of Germany. The American Revolution interrupted the peaceful course of his ministry, and exposed him to various annoyances and severe trials. His love for liberty, his naturally ardent temperament, led him to espouse the cause of the American colonies with great zeal and patriotic devotion. His congregation, composed entirely of Germans, during the whole conflict identified themselves thoroughly in interest with their Pastor, and were the strenuous advocates and heroic defenders of their adopted country. The *German Fusilier Company*, composed also of members of this church, participated in the dangers, the struggles, and the sufferings of the War. They bore a conspicuous part in the military history of the South, and rendered very important service. Their Captain fell at the seige of

Savannah. Mr. Martin had three sons in the engagement, but they escaped without injury.

When the British, under General Prevost, in May, 1779, made their first advance on Chasleston, Mr. Martin had his home on a small farm, at that time about a mile outside of the city limits. In the panic which prevailed, it was feared that his dwelling might furnish a cover to the enemy's approach. In anticipation of such a result, the building was burned by the military authorities, with the prompt and cordial assent of the patriotic pastor. No assault was, however, made upon the city. The sickness of the enemy's troops and the rapid appearance of the American army compelled Prevost to retire. When the crisis was over, and all danger seemed removed, the minister's house was rebuilt, and he resumed his quiet life and regular duties. But the respite did not continue very long. The peace which he enjoyed was only temporary. A second expedition of land and naval forces, under the direction of Sir Henry Clinton, in the spring of 1780, approached the city. Mr. Martin's house, which was just beyond the line of our defensive works, was the second time burned by our own troops. To this the good man cheerfully submitted, although he received no compensation for the loss which he sustained.

Mr. Martin, on the surrender of Charleston to the British, at first, suffered no interruption in his pastoral work. His church continued open, and his congregation worshipped God without fear or molestation. The fact that the exercises were conducted in German, rendered his political position less conspicuous and more secure than that of his brethren who preached in the English language. The Hessian troops, who formed a part of the British force, were, however, sometimes sent by the military power, to attend his services and to mark his expressions. It was soon ascertained that his ministrations were not favorable to the royal cause. He was quickly informed, that he must, in the services of the sanctuary, pray for the King of England. This he resolutely refused to do. Conscientious in the course he had adopted, he was willing to forfeit everything he possessed, even life itself, rather than surrender a principle. The result was that his Church was closed, and his pulpit labors interdicted, during the occupation of the city by the enemy. He was not even allowed to enter his church. For a time he was put under

arrest, being confined to his house, and a guard placed over him. Subsequently his property was confiscated and he was driven from the city.\* He remained in the interior of the State, until the close of the War, when he returned, and his farm was restored to him. He rejoiced in the success of the American arms, that the principles, involved in the contest, were recognized and adopted, and that the country he so well loved, after a long and painful strife, free, happy and honored, was entering upon a new career of growth, prosperity and usefulness.

Although aged and having lost his former physical vigor, his congregation still clung to him with warm affection. They urged him on his return in 1783, to resume his pastoral relations until a stated minister could be procured for them from Germany. He consented to this arrangement, and continued his labors, till the arrival of his successor, Rev. John C. Faber, in 1787, when he was released from further service with a vote of thanks from the Church for the fidelity, with which he had ministered to their spiritual interests. He lived several years, after his withdrawal from the active duties of the ministry, on the little farm with which there were so many associations connected. But his physical, as well as his mental, powers gradually failed him, and he closed his honored and useful life, July 27th, 1795, illustrating in his death the principles which he advocated through a long life.

---

\* During the absence of Mr. Martin, Rev. F. Daser, who had been Pastor as early as 1771, and who was required, on entering upon his duties, to "promise that he would be faithful, industrious and conscientious in his walk and conversation, and to serve his flock as a faithful shepherd," and Rev. Christian Streit, who had served as a Chaplain in the American army, and was also taken as a prisoner by the British, officiated in the Lutheran Church. The official records, we find, are signed during this period, either by one or the other, and sometimes by both. Rev. J. C. Faber continued Pastor from 1787 till 1805. He was succeeded by his brother Rev. Charles Faber, who died of yellow fever, in 1811. Temporary supplies from other denominations were obtained till 1814, when the Rev. John Bachman, (now D. D. & LL. D.,) received and accepted a call from the church, on the recommendation of Rev. Drs. Quitman and Mayer. Now almost an octogenarian, he has labored for more than half a century, the faithful, "loved and honored Pastor, in this interesting and important field of labor.

From all that we can gather with regard to the character of Mr. Martin, we infer that he was a very pious man, thoroughly honest, faithfully devoted to his work, and exceedingly useful as a minister of the gospel. Among his most prominent traits of character, was a rigid conscientiousness, an unswerving integrity, that no considerations of personal interest or expediency could carry away from the straight line of duty. He was a man of great decision and courage, firm and persistent in the maintenance of his principles, with an energy of will, and a zeal which no discouragement could repress, and no failure abate. In the vindication of what he believed to be the truth, he was prepared for any emergency. Nothing could stand in the path of his purpose. His energies increased with every demand that was made upon them, and his spirit rose buoyant, as those around him often became more despondent. In his family government, some thought that he was too stern, and somewhat severe, but his children, although they stood in awe of him, and reverently regarded his authority, were very devoted to him, for he was kind and considerate, and never unmindful of the amenities and benefactions, that belong to the household. In the church he, also, maintained a rigid discipline. His decisions carried with them great influence. His presence and assistance were often invoked in the adjustment of family difficulties, and of secular disputes, when all other means of reconciliation had failed. The result was generally successful. He formed his own opinions, and acted on his own convictions. The people appreciated his sagacity, and relied on his clear, practical judgment. He fully identified himself with their interests; he steadfastly devoted himself to their moral elevation. He was to them a father; the old rejoiced in him as a friend, and the children looked upon him as a parent. In his private character he was a man of warm sympathies and generous heart, of a fervid disposition, of great depth of feeling, and this intensity of his nature was seen in his deep-toned, simple-hearted piety, and also in his preaching, which was characterized by a high degree of animation and unction. It was the constant burden of his heart, and the earnest purpose of his life, to honor Christ in the salvation of souls. In his early youth he had been trained to habits of industry and thorough mental discipline, and to those sound religious principles which imparted so much strength and

energy to his character, in maturer years. His simplicity and meekness, his sincerity and faithfulness, were the fruits of his pure, earnest faith. Such a man is a blessing in any community, and his death, a public calamity.

## LXXIV.

## PAUL HENKEL.

Few men in our Church exercised a wider influence in his day, or left a deeper impression upon those with whom he was brought in contact, than Paul Henkel. His name is closely connected with our past history, and his memory is still regarded, in many parts of the land, with grateful interest.

His paternal ancestor, Rev. Gerhard Henkel, immigrated to this country at a very early period. He had served, for a season, as Chaplain in the University of Frankfort, and was subsequently appointed Court Preacher. In one of his discourses, however, the earnestness, with which he presented the truth, greatly offended his sovereign. For the purpose of escaping additional difficulties he immediately resigned his position, and came to this country. This was in the year 1740. He settled in Germantown, Pa., where he assisted in the erection of a Lutheran church, which he did not live to see completed, as he died soon after his arrival. Every succeeding generation in the family furnished its representatives for the ranks of the Christian ministry.

The subject of our sketch, was the oldest son of Jacob, and a great grandson of Gerhard, Henkel. He was born December 15th, 1754, in Rowan county, N. C. His parents were pious. They believed in the covenant obligations, which rested upon them, to train their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Paul was in infancy dedicated to God in Christian baptism, and early instructed in the plan of salvation. He was reared in troublous times. Whilst yet a youth, he, with his father's family, and other families in the neighborhood, was compelled to seek refuge in the mountains of Western Virginia, in consequence of a sanguinary war, waged by the Catawba Indians against the white population of that country. Here, for a time, they lived in forts and blockhouses, guarding themselves as well as they could, from the cruel attacks of

savage hostility. Under these influences, the young man, often performing the arduous and perilous duties of a sentinel or spy, became familiar with scenes of hardship, and accustomed to the use of the rifle. The discipline, through which he passed at this period, more successfully fitted him for subsequent duties.

In 1776, the preaching of Whitefield and Wesley attracted much attention, and excited the deepest interest throughout the country. To his recollections of these times, Mr. Henkel often referred. It was, at this season, that he, with his brother Moses, was awoken to serious reflection, and led to make the subject of religion a personal concern. Ultimately they were both brought, not only to a full conviction of the truth, but to a practical and cordial acceptance of it. One of the first ideas, with which they were impressed, was, that they must become ministers of the gospel. Moses entered the Methodist Church, and became quite a prominent preacher in that communion. Paul, thinking that a more extensive course of theological training was required, commenced a course of study, with a view to the Lutheran ministry, under the direction of Pastor Kruch, of Frederick, Md. Here he acquired a knowledge of the Latin and Greek, and other branches of learning; and with great diligence pursued his theological studies. He was examined as a candidate for the sacred office and licensed to preach by the Synod of Pennsylvania, at that time the only Lutheran Synod in this country. In 1792 he was permanently invested with the ministerial office, the ordination services being performed by Rev. John Frederick Schmidt, of Philadelphia.

His first field of labor was New Market, Virginia. Having received a call from several vacant congregations in that section of the country, he felt it his duty to settle there. But his labors were not confined to that region. They were extended to Augusta, Madison, Pendleton and Wythe counties, in all of which he laid the foundation of churches. He occupied very much the position of an itinerant missionary, visiting destitute portions of the Church, gathering together our scattered members, instructing and confirming the youth, and administering the sacraments. After having labored for many years among the people, to whom he was first introduced, he removed to Staunton, Augusta county, taking charge of several congregations, but after a service of three years at this point, he resumed his labors among his former people.

In 1800, he received and accepted a call to Rowan, his native county in North Carolina. But here, as in Virginia, his duties were not restricted to his immediate charge. The care of our Lutheran population, wherever there was no provision for its wants, claimed his attention, and all the time, that could be spared from his own people, was faithfully devoted to the interests of our Church in the surrounding country. During his residence in North Carolina, he cultivated the most intimate and friendly relations with the Moravians, who had a flourishing settlement at Salem. He interchanged visits with them, and frequently officiated in their pulpits.

The location in Rowan being unfavorable to health, and his family being frequently afflicted with fever and ague, he relinquished this field of labor in 1805, and returned again to New Market, but he was not disposed to confine his labors to any one particular charge, although invitations to desirable localities were extended to him. He preferred laboring as an independent missionary, preaching wherever his services were needed, and building up the Church in destitute regions, not depending for his support upon any missionary fund, but upon the good will of the people he served. He made repeated tours through Western Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana and Ohio, encouraging our people, and, when practicable, organizing them into congregations. During the War of 1812, he removed to Point Pleasant, Mason county, Va. Here he continued to labor on, and formed several Lutheran churches. He remained until the close of the War, when, with his family he returned to his old home at New Market, and resumed his missionary work.

In 1808, whilst a resident of Rowan, he, with several of his brethren belonging to the Synod of Pennsylvania, united in the formation of the Synod of North Carolina. At a later period he also assisted in the organization of the Ohio Synod. He subsequently met with this body, and was recognized as one of its members. He seemed deeply interested in the enlargement and prosperity of the Church, and was always ready to contribute to its progress and success.

He published several volumes which, for that period in our Church, had a wide circulation. In 1809, he wrote a work in the German language, which he afterwards trans-

lated into English, on the subject of Christian Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Part of the work is devoted to the defence of Infant Baptism and the Mode of Sprinkling in preference to that of Immersion. The discussion is of a popular character, adapted to the capacity of the common reader, and was, in its day, deemed highly useful. In 1810, he issued a German Hymn Book, and in 1816, one in English, a portion of the Hymns being arranged for the Gospels and Epistles of the Ecclesiastical Year. Many of the Hymns, both German and English, are his own composition. In 1811, he published his German, and soon after his English, Catechism, making no changes in the substance of Luther's, but only reducing the longer to shorter questions, in order that they might be more easily understood and committed to memory by the learner. As he very much favored the observance of the Church festivals, commemorative of the great facts in the history of redemption, he appended to the Catechisms an explanation of these occasions. He was very regular and faithful in his catechetical instructions. In his theological views he adhered with great tenacity to the standards and usages of the Church. He was opposed to removing the old landmarks. In the earlier part of his ministry he approved of some of the alterations, made by Melanchthon, in the Augsburg Confession, but at a later period of his life, his doctrinal position was the unaltered Confession. With great zeal he advocated the cordial adoption of this venerable symbol, and he had the twenty-one doctrinal articles published in pamphlet form for the edification of the Church. He also published a small German work in rhyme, entitled *Zeitvertreib* (*Past-Time*), the design of which was, in satirical invective to rebuke fanaticism, and superstition, the follies and vices of the times. His irony, or sarcasm, was, sometimes, very keen and withering.

Mr. Henkel possessed a clear, well-balanced and vigorous mind. It was original, quick and comprehensive. As a preacher he had more than ordinary power. His discourses were able and instructive. In the commencement of his sermon he was slow and often tedious, but, as he proceeded, he became animated and eloquent, his thoughts were appropriate and his language fluent. His style was always simple and natural, and his illustrations forcible. The people heard him gladly, with marked attention, and his opinions always carried with them great

weight. He educated a large number of candidates for the ministry, who have occupied responsible positions in the Church.

He was a man of untiring industry, of a perseverance that never yielded to any obstacle that was not absolutely insuperable, of an unwearied application that never evaded any service required by fidelity to duty. Although his health was not good, he was always employed, assiduously engaged from day to day, in reading, writing, preaching, often, too, laboring with his own hands. Without complaint, or regret, he was ready to toil and make sacrifices, that he might accomplish the object of his ministry, and "finish his course with joy."

In private life Mr. Henkel was genial, kind and considerate. He possessed great equanimity of temper. He was affable and communicative. His conversation was entertaining and impressive, full of interesting incident and pertinent anecdote. He was regarded with warm affection and cordial confidence. His friendships were sincere and constant, his friends numerous and devoted. They fondly loved and fully trusted him. One of his most prominent traits was a sterling integrity that never suffered him to relax from his convictions of truth, or duty. He was not the man to be swerved from his purpose by policy or adverse opinions. He had much self-reliance, and independence of character. He was distinguished for his consistency. His piety was not fluctuating and superficial, but steadfast and reliable. His deportment was correct and well ordered. His habits of life were plain and simple. He was opposed to extravagance, to everything like ostentation or demonstration, yet in the discharge of his official duties he was always dignified, and when ministering in the sanctuary he invariably wore his clerical robes, made of rich black silk.

In person Mr. Henkel was large and well formed, measuring nearly six feet in height. He had a keen black eye, and black hair. His physical organs were all well developed. His walk was rapid and his carriage stately. He was erect as an Indian, somewhat inclined to corpulency, yet athletic and quick in his movements. His fine appearance and expressive countenance usually attracted attention.

In 1776 he was united in marriage to Elizabeth Negley, who with her father's family had emigrated from New Jer-

sey to Western Virginia. He was the father of nine children, six sons and three daughters. Five of his sons became ministers in the Lutheran Church, the eldest entered the medical profession.

Mr. Henkel had long stood as a sentinel upon the watch tower. But his health gradually failed him. He was, towards the close of his life, attacked with paraplesia, which rendered him almost helpless. Resting, however, on the promises of the gospel which he had, for many years, presented to others, he cheerfully submitted to the dispensation. On the 17th of November, 1825, in the 71st year of his age, he was released from his sufferings. The Master called him from his labors to his reward. His body, so long the temple of the Holy Ghost, was gently laid to rest in front of the Lutheran church at New Market, where it will await the resurrection of the just.

#### LXXV.

#### JACOB WINGARD.

The Lutheran Church, in the death of Jacob Wingard, of South Carolina, lost one of her most faithful and promising sons. In his 29th year, almost at the very beginning of his useful career, when the Church seemed so much to require his services, he was stricken down. But the Head of the Church is the light and defence of the Church. He will take care of its interests. Whatever is ordered by Him is wise and good. Although his ways are often inscrutable, beyond human comprehension, He will yet make them all plain and hereafter clearly interpret his providences. It is our duty to be calmly submissive to the Divine will, although our expectations may be disappointed, our plans thwarted and our wishes all frustrated.

The subject of the present sketch was a native of Lexington District, S. C., and was born on the 2nd of December, 1802. Brought up on his father's farm, he received in his youth the ordinary instruction in the rudiments of an education, such as was then common in a country school, but at that early period he showed an aptitude for learning, and was distinguished for his success in study. His youth was marked by a freedom from all immoral tendencies, and a love for that which was pure and lovely and

of good report. He had no fondness for the amusements, in which his comrades generally participated. His enjoyments were derived from other sources, his aspirations were higher and nobler. He seemed unusually mature for one of his years. In the character of his mind and heart there were indications of something more than ordinary. His gentle, affable manners, and his serious and correct deportment, made him the favorite of the whole community. It was not, however, until he reached his twentieth year that he became interested in the subject of religion as a personal matter. Deeply impressed by the truths of God's word, his convictions were deep and pungent. This greatly surprised his more intimate friends, who were accustomed, in the consistent and exemplary character which he daily exhibited, to look upon him as a model of every thing that was good. But no one could have felt more intensely than he did his personal unworthiness, his great guilt in the sight of heaven, and only, when he was brought to rely solely on the merits of his Saviour, did he find peace for his soul.

After Mr. Wingard had fully and unreservedly consecrated himself to the Lord, one of the first ideas that filled his mind was, that he must become a minister of the Gospel and labor for the extension of Christ's kingdom. But then the ministry seemed too sacred for one so sinful and unworthy as he regarded himself. For a long time his mind was in a state of anxious solicitude, of deep suspense. There was the careful inquiry, the inward conflict. He was desirous of ascertaining the path of duty. His earnest prayer was, "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" Speedily his doubts vanished, his difficulties yielded. He felt that he was called by the Master to labor in his vineyard, in the ministry of reconciliation, and with his new and spiritual view of Christianity he entered upon this purpose with all the vigor and strength of his soul.

After a course of three years' study, under the direction of his Pastor, he was in the year 1825, licensed to preach the gospel by the Synod of South Carolina. Having received and accepted a call to the pastoral work, he at once commenced his labors in the Lexington District, making Sandy Run his principal preaching place. With the most exalted views of the ministry, he earnestly and actively engaged in its duties, and very soon took position as one of the most popular preachers of the day. His efforts

were greatly blessed. Many seals were given to his ministry. He continued to labor in this field for nearly four years with great acceptance and fidelity. He was fond of books and interested in study. By assiduous application he had made some progress in classical and sacred literature, notwithstanding the disadvantages which environed his path. But he desired increased facilities for the acquisition of knowledge. As his physical constitution was naturally feeble and his health, by close confinement and constant attention to duty, had become impaired, a respite from labor was deemed necessary, and he concluded to go to Gettysburg, Pa., with a view of continuing his studies in the Theological Seminary, and under the impression that a change of climate would be beneficial to his health. This was in the autumn of 1829. He remained in Gettysburg about a year, but his physical powers became very much prostrated. During the year he had a very severe attack of fever, from the effects of which he never recovered. Early in September of 1830, he returned to the South, accompanied by his friend, the Rev. David Jacobs, at the time an instructor in the *Gettysburg Gymnasium*, who was himself in search of health.\* The journey was long and irksome, attended with many trials and discouragements. They were nearly three weeks on the way. The stage-coach was twice upset, and once precipitated over the abutment of a high bridge. Mr. Wingard had one of his arms fractured, and his condition, owing to the delicate state of his system, was for some time considered precarious. The following November, although pale, wan and broken in health, he thought he was sufficiently strong to attend the annual meeting of the Synod of South Carolina, when he was permanently invested with the sacred office.†

---

\* Mr. Jacobs never returned. On his journey homeward he was so much indisposed, that he was compelled to take his bed and call in a physician, at Shepherdstown, Va. He died November 4th, 1830, in advance of his friend, Mr. Wrigard, only a few months. *Vide*, sketch of Rev. D. Jacobs, *Ecanglical Review*, Vol. VII. p. 300.

† At an earlier period in our history, as a Church, in this country, the Licentiate System, as it is called, was adopted by all the Synods. A candidate, after he was licensed to preach, was often continued on probation, three or four years, before he received ordination, although the act conferred no additional powers. In some parts of our Church the system has been altogether abandoned for what

He returned to his father's home, but his work on earth was then nearly completed. His enfeebled health rapidly declined. The most unfavorable symptoms were developed. Insidious and unrelenting disease had taken hold of his system, and wasting consumption marked him as its victim. He felt that his days were numbered, but he was perfectly resigned, calm and composed in prospect of death. As he approached the grave, his utterances were those of assured hope and faith, telling that the victory was won. "The clouds," he says, "begin gradually to disperse and the sun to shine with all its brightness into my soul. He adds, "I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my departure is at hand." "My flesh and my heart faileth; but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion forever." "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? Thanks be to God, who giveth me the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ." He rested on the promises of the Gospel. The appropriate and familiar language of Scripture was continually on his lips. The Saviour was the only ground of his hope, the constant theme of his conversation. To his friends who surrounded his dying couch, he said, "I am happy." "Blessed be God! I am so happy." Thus he continued to discourse as long as he could speak, till his released spirit left its wasted body and rose to its rest in the presence of the Redeemer. Even in death his countenance was irradiated with a heavenly smile; the triumphs of Christian faith were displayed, and the power of religion in the soul magnified. Surrounded by loving hearts, he died, January 18th, 1831, and, amid a concourse of devoted friends, was interred in the cemetery of St. Michael's Church with appropriate services, conducted by Dr. Strobel, and Rev. Messrs. Scheck, Rawl and Dreher.

In person Mr. Wingard is said to have been somewhat below the medium size, of a delicate formation with strongly marked features, an aquiline nose and projecting chin, of a dark complexion with black hair and dark eyes. His countenance was intellectual and, when roused to action, very animated.

---

seems the more scriptural mode of investing an individual with the sacred office, so soon as the Church has given him a call. Probation should rather precede than succeed the candidate's introduction into the ministry.

He was regarded as a man of more than usual promise, a minister of peculiar gifts and graces. He was a good preacher, exceedingly solemn and tender. There was something very attractive in his manner. His sermons were characterized by naturalness and simplicity, yet by great pathos, depth and strength of fervor. "His preaching was always extemporaneous," says Dr. Strobel, "and his voice, although not very loud, was uncommonly sweet, and its tones vibrated upon the ear like the soft strains of a flute." So earnest and impressive was he, that he left upon the minds of his hearers the conviction, that he preached not himself, that he was filled with zeal for his Master's glory and love for the souls of men. The simple truths of the gospel were the burden of all his preaching.

His piety was of a high type. His heart glowed with love to Christ and his cause. A marked feature of his religious life was his deep consciousness of the evil of sin and of his utter unworthiness before God. Evangelical in spirit, exemplary in conduct, faithful in the discharge of duty, his conservative influence was felt by all who came within its power.

In his pastoral work he was active and earnest. Although warmly attached to the Church of his fathers, he sympathized very much with our Methodist brethren in their measures to promote the interests of Christ's cause. He was the friend and advocate of protracted meetings, and of the use of special efforts for revivals of religion. The ruling passion of his soul was to lead sinners from the error of their ways and to save the perishing from eternal death. In his habits of thought and feeling his sympathies were strongly with the people. For their improvement he faithfully labored, and he was eminently successful, not only in the conversion of immortal souls, but in guiding inquirer, and in conducting the people of God to higher attainments in piety.

#### LXXVI.

#### AARON JACOB KARN.

The subject of the present sketch we met, for the first time, in the autumn of 1837, the year before we left College. He had just entered the Institution, a young man





of eighteen, with a healthful appearance and a bright, intelligent countenance, and, although he had, as yet, enjoyed few opportunities for mental culture, he was full of ardor, and entered with great zest upon the work before him. On our return to *Alma Mater*, in 1839, we renewed our acquaintance. He was then a member of the Sophomore class, engaged in the successful prosecution of his studies. In the discharge of our official duties, we were frequently brought in contact, but never in conflict, with him. We always found him frank and courteous, pleasant and engaging in his manners. We enjoyed many proofs of his friendship and confidence. After his introduction into the Christian ministry we met occasionally in ecclesiastical convention. He was a delegate from the Synod of South Carolina to the conventions of the General Synod, at Reading in 1857, and at Pittsburg in 1859. He seemed to have lost none of his former vivacity, his genial disposition and confiding nature. At Reading we heard him preach, the first and only time. The subject was the "Syrophenecian Woman." It was a carefully prepared discourse, evangelical and instructive, and made a very favorable impression. He presented the truth with great simplicity and directness. His words, manner, matter, tones of voice and attitude, were in keeping with the service he was rendering to God. The last time he visited Gettysburg was in 1858, the occasion of our *Annual Commencement*. He was present at the meeting of the *Alumni Association*, and participated in its proceedings. He closed the exercises with fervent prayer for God's blessing upon his *Alma Mater*. He came to our home, and with a heart full of love and zeal, pleaded for the interests of our Southern Zion. With a kind partiality altogether undeserved, he seemed to think that our services were needed in connection with the youthful College, just established, at Newberry, S. C. In his judgment, and in that of others whom he had consulted, this was our mission, and it was our duty to consent to occupy this inviting field of usefulness. We listened with deference to his arguments; we were deeply touched by the warmth and eloquence, with which he presented the cause, and if we had, at the time, allowed our feelings to determine the question, we would at once have yielded to his wishes. But after a serious and careful consideration of the subject, we felt that it was our duty to de-

cline the request. From events that subsequently transpired, we believe that a kind Providence ordered our decision. This was the last extended conversation, or correspondence, with our worthy and beloved brother.

Aaron J. Karn was born in Loudon county, Virginia, August, 1820. Early in life he dedicated himself to the service of the Lord, and became deeply impressed with the conviction, that it was his duty to prepare for the ministry of reconciliation. Established in the faith of Jesus, and giving, in a correct and consistent life, evidence of the sincerity of his profession, he left home for Gettysburg, in the fall of 1837, and entered the Preparatory Department of Pennsylvania College. He finished his course in College in 1842, and was graduated with an Historical Oration on the "Moors in Spain," as his *Commencement* exercise. On the completion of his Theological studies in the Theological Seminary, he was licensed to preach, and accepted a call to Pinegrove, Schuylkill county, Pa. In the summer of 1845, he commenced his pastoral labors, at Canton, Ohio. Here he remained for three years, when he resigned, in order to take charge of our Lutheran interests in Savannah, Georgia. In this position he faithfully labored, enjoying the confidence of his people, and of the whole community, until his physical strength gave way, and advancing disease compelled him to suspend the exercise of his office. His congregation, so devoted to him, thought a trip to foreign lands might be of value to him in restoring his impaired health. They provided the expenses for the journey; they secured supplies for the pulpit during his absence. He sailed for Europe, and traveled through France, Italy, Germany and Switzerland, but deriving no advantage from the tour, he fondly turned his eyes to his native country, which, in the providence of God, he was permitted to reach, only to spend his last days among loved ones, and to close his life, cheered by the tender sympathies of kind friends whom he cherished with so much affection. His decline was very rapid. Sensible of his approaching end, his mind was serene and entirely submissive. Nothing could be more sincere, animating and delightful than the confidence which he evinced in the Lord Jesus Christ. He felt that he was a sinner saved by grace, and that God, his Saviour, would not forsake him. Rev. Mr. Pratt, of the Episcopal Church, who was with him in his last hours, speaks of "his sure hope and tri-

umphant death." He peacefully passed through the conflict, and in the trying hour gave evidence of the strength of his faith and the fulness of his patience. He expired at the Richmond House, Chicago, December 19th, 1860, and slept in Jesus. Stricken down in the vigor of manhood, in the meridian of life, his death, so premature to the Church, was the realization of all that was dearest to his heart, and to his pure and sanctified aspirations.

His remains were conveyed from Chicago to Massillon, Ohio, to be buried with kindred dust. Before their departure, there were religious exercises at the Richmond House, conducted by Rev. G. A. Bowers of the Lutheran, and Rev. Messrs. Clarkson (an old College friend,) and Pratt of the Episcopal Church. On their arrival at Massillon, before they were consigned to the tomb, services were held in the Episcopal church, conducted by Rev. Mr. Morell, the Pastor, and Rev. Messrs. D. Garver and J. J. Fast, of our own Church. Mr. Garver preached a sermon from the words, "And Aaron died there on top of the mountain," in which he exhibited the elevating influence of faith and hope in Christ, in prospect of approaching dissolution.

Mr. Karn was, in 1849, united in marriage to Lucy M. Hawk. His wife and two children preceded him into the eternal world. A daughter, an interesting little girl, survived him, who was left in the care of her uncle, Samuel C. Hawk, of Chicago.

The subject of our narrative was a faithful watchman in the service of his Master. His heart was in tender sympathy with his flock. He never deserted them in affliction, or in the time of danger. During the prevalence of the Yellow Fever in Savannah, in 1854 and 1858, he continued at his post, exhausting his time and his strength, ministering to the sick and the dying, not only of his own congregation, but to others who were not in church connection. In his attentions he was energetic, active and heroic to all classes, ready to make any sacrifice for the relief and comfort of those who were suffering. The scenes, through which he passed in his kind offices to the sick and the burial of the dead, were most distressing and heart-rending. It is supposed that his physical constitution sustained an injury from the influences of the epidemic, which was permanent.

He was considered an earnest Pastor, steadfastly devoted to the interests of his people. He had the power of at-

tracting to him most strongly and of binding most tenderly to his own, the hearts of warm and loving friends. He was remarkable for being able to gain the confidence of others, so that they could express their feelings without effort, or embarrassment. He possessed those excellencies of character, which invariably secure esteem. His temperament was full of kindness, his heart was true and firm in its attachments. In all the relations of life his conduct was marked by integrity, charity for the failings of others, and benevolence to those who looked to him for advice, sympathy, or aid in affliction. Always accessible, yet unobtrusive, genial yet dignified, he secured, in a high degree, the respect and confidence of his associates. All who came within the range of his influence were impressed with his moral worth and Christian fidelity. During the last years of his life, his character matured rapidly, and developed a marked Christian holiness.

The death of Mr. Karn was an occasion of deep sorrow. His *Church Council*, in the resolutions they adopted, testify to his faithfulness in preaching the Word, and in ministering to the sick, and make special mention of his brave and self-denying services during the seasons of scourging pestilence. The *Morning News*, of Savannah, speaks of him as one "whose purity, benevolence and amiability endeared him to a very large circle of acquaintances and friends, outside of his immediate congregation." The *Lutheran Observer* in an editorial, says: "He was an able preacher and an excellent man. He had the power to win and to retain the affections. His ministry was fruitful in good results, and he will live enshrined in the holiest affections of many precious souls, whom he brought to Christ."

Whilst we are so often reminded that "life is even a vapor, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away," let us be grateful that there are so many illustrations of the power and excellency of Christianity, which can conduct us with honor and usefulness through life, and minister comfort and consolation to us in death. In the midst of our duties, in humble dependence on God, with faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, may we improve the lessons taught us, so that when our labors on earth are ended, we also may have a "title clear" to an inheritance that is imperishable, and that fadeth not away!

and ministerial method and manners in this question, and to guide the reader in his investigation of the various topics and controversies respecting the Lord's Supper, and to supply a series of authorities which will be convenient for study, to particularize the various points of view which have been taken in respect to the Lord's Supper.

### ARTICLE V.

#### THE LORD'S SUPPER.

By Rev. J. B. GRESS, Easton, Pa.

*"Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."*  
*John 6: 68.*

#### *Introduction.*

The dogmas of the Lord's Supper, which have received the sanction of the different branches of the Christian Church, are generally regarded as declarative of a final decision of commentators, on the interesting and important subject, of the *body and blood* of our Lord Jesus Christ. For though the creed of one denomination, is often regarded mere heresy in the eyes of the other, yet all respectively claiming to occupy pre-eminently the only true stand-point in the Church, boldly, perhaps, now and then, *presumptuously*, enunciate the behest, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther!" Every attempt, therefore, to throw new light upon this perplexed subject, or to define and illustrate it, in a manner which may be deemed at variance with established belief—often, to besure, venerable rather in respect to its antiquity, than its strict scriptural truthfulness—must be pronounced by some, at least, not only as vain, but even as presumptuous. I readily admit that the opinions of men, whose piety and learning have given them a title to be teachers, not masters, in Israel, deserve and generally receive, the homage which is due to superior attainments; yet, we are told, "To err is human," an axiom which accounts for the fact, that human dogmas are not always exempt from fallacy, nor consequently the results of human investigations above a well-founded distrust, or suspicion. Hence, blindly, or servilely to follow the dictates of others, is as wrong, nay sinful, as it is dangerous and disreputable. Besides, the apostolic injunction, "To prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good," is quite as binding upon us, as upon our predecessors; and, therefore, the Lord's Supper is a theme legitimately open, in every age, to an honest inquiry, or a candid discussion.

The very fact, that amongst the leading theologians, both before and after the Reformation, the most striking diversity of opinion has been entertained, relative to the design and meaning of this Christian institution, clearly warrants the attempt of a renewed and careful investigation of the subject. Thus, one pronounces it to be a sin-offering; another, the mere sign, or symbol of such an offering. This one boldly asserts, that by the act of consecration, the bread and wine are converted into the real body and blood of our Lord; while that one, no less boldly, affirms the real presence to exist, but *in, with, and under*, the same sacramental elements. Again, a mystical presence, and a spiritual manducation, are taught confidently, as the only sound and tenable exegesis, of which the subject is susceptible. "No, no," says another, "it receives its proper, *hermeneutically* correct, interpretation and divine saction, only in so far as a purely moral influence is predicated, as the end and bearing of its *constitution*." "You are all in sad and dangerous error, and evidently ignorant of the first principles of Christianity," cries a third, "for the Lord's Supper is simply *meat and drink for babes in Christ*, and entirely superseded by the inward light, with which the soul of the more advanced and mature Christian is divinely and savingly illuminated." From this, it will be perceived, to what an extent Protestants are arrayed, and justly too, against Roman Catholics, and how strikingly one denomination, of the former, differs eucharistically, from another, or assumes a hostile attitude against dissentients generally. Where so many discordant and often *clashing* opinions prevail, and this too, in respect to a single evangelical question, all may be more or less erroneous, and some of them even false. One thing, at least, is certain, that all *cannot* be true, and that some, if true, would alike contradict common sense, as well as the plainest teachings of the religion of Jesus Christ, and, therefore, *ought not* to be true. All mutually charge each other with unsound views, and each, with as charitable frame of mind as is possible, where zeal may predominate over knowledge, feels constrained to recognize a heretic, or imbecile in every one but himself. Under such circumstances, sincerely and deeply to be regretted, it must be evident, that to advance any new theory on this much controverted and most weighty subject, fraught, as it should seem, more or less, with so many and grave difficulties, is likely to be met

by those whose judgments are warped, either by education, or a spirit of faction, on behalf of a favorite *shibboleth*, with frowns, perhaps sneers and contempt. However much as I may have to apprehend from ignorance or prejudice, potent champions in blind partyism, I shall, notwithstanding, indulge the hope of being, in some degree, instrumental in exhibiting in a new light, and its true-sense, the nature and design of the Lord's Supper. While, therefore, I respectfully submit this treatise to the unbiased judgment and candid decision of the conscientious searchers after truth, of whatever name or creed they may be, I confidently look forward to an ultimate and just verdict from man, man in his independent integrity, and because seeking but to comprehend and disseminate the truth as it is in Jesus, the gracious approval of God.

*The Exodus of the Hebrews, or the Tenth and last Miracle.*

The intimate connection in which the Jewish passover and the Lord's Supper stand to each other, and the light which the former must necessarily throw upon an attempt correctly to interpret the latter, make it desirable first, to treat of the Old Testament institution, before its correlate or counterpart, in the New Testament, is made the subject of investigation.

It is in chapter XII of the 2 Book of Moses, that the very extraordinary history of the institution of the remarkable and interesting anniversary festival of the Jewish church—the passover, called also the Lord's passover—is recorded. Its name, I may state, is derived from the Hebrew *pasahh*, which, according to Gesenius, signifies *to pass over, to pass through, to pass by and spare*, or simply, *to spare*, in allusion to that awful judgment of Jehovah, in consequence of which, Egypt's first born, both of man and beast, was singled out as the unfortunate victim of his retributive justice, while that of the Hebrews, was spared or passed over, by the *destroying angel*. In vain, until now, has been wrought a series of the most stupendous miracles, to impress the minds of the haughty Egyptians, with a lively and powerful conviction of the profound and abiding interest, which the God of Jacob took in the welfare of his oppressed and despised, but chosen, people, and to move, if possible, the obdurate heart of their proud and defiant monarch, to consent to their immediate departure from his inhospitable dominions, and, consequently,

to a final and absolute redemption from their long and miserable servitude. No sooner had the vacillating tyrant of the Nile, acknowledged the hand of the Omnipotent, in the astounding events, that, with a rapidity as remarkable as it was appalling, transpired in his trembling presence, and signified his willingness to comply with his demands, at once, so just and reasonable, yet, at the same time, so hard and impossible to resist, when suddenly forgetting, or disregarding, his past alarms and the perplexing straits, into which his sullen obstinacy had so often, and so deservedly plunged him, and not thinking, that under such unfavorable circumstances, to hold out any longer against the repeatedly declared will of heaven must inevitably involve him in still greater and more merited calamities, and, eventually, even endanger the stability of his throne, he evinced the vanity of insulted pride, and suppressing, for the moment, the rising emotions of fear and shame, again assumed a hostile attitude, and boldly bid defiance to the King of kings. Once more, the famed land of the Pharaohs and of the pyramids, the loved home of Osiris and Isis, the puissant divinities of a mythic creed, was to be the scene of a tragedy, at once appalling and calculated, while it subdued the mind of the most stubborn, to humble into the dust, the sceptered greatness of this world. The first-born offspring, from the king on his lofty throne, to the lowly peasant at the plow,\* from the fiery steed, to the gentle sheep, &c., was to be destroyed, on the ever memorable night of the fourteenth of the month *Nisan*, corresponding, according to some chronologists, to March, and according to others, to April or May, in the year before Christ, one thousand four hundred and ninety-one. That the first-born of the Hebrews might not share the summary and inevitable fate that awaited that of their unfeeling and perfidious oppressors, the unhappy posterity of Abraham were directed to stain the lintels and posts of the door-ways of their houses, with the blood of the lamb, which every family, or household among them was ordered to kill on the eventful occasion, that the Lord, or the destroying angel, in passing through the guilty land, ripe

---

\* By the phrase, *lowly peasant*, I do not mean a *farmer*, in the acceptance of the term in the United States, but a *dependent* cultivator of the soil. That one is a *freeman*, this a *serf*. I honor the former, the latter I pity.





for the impending retribution, to smite the doomed victims of their relentless task-masters, might, humanly speaking, recognize their habitations, by those conspicuous crimson badges, and not confound the innocent with the guilty. At length, the tenth, the last, and the most terrific of all the renowned *plagues of Egypt*, completed the humiliation of the arrogant and powerful Egyptians, and prepared the minds of those inveterate enemies of the Hebrew race, the despised shepherds and abused strangers, to come to terms, at once, speedily and finally. Sensible that longer resistance would be futile, if not utterly ruinous ; deplored the sad state of the country, already tottering upon the verge of dissolution ; rendered irresolute by schemes, more than once frustrated, and hopes as often disappointed ; while agitated by apprehensions for the future, and ashamed of the past, which he had hitherto acted in the national drama, the "king that knew not Joseph, rose up in the night," and sending for Moses and Aaron—the one, the future law-giver, the other, the first high-priest, of the liberated nation, and at once the representatives of their people, and the vicegerents of their God, and bid them "Rise up, and get you forth from among my people, both ye and the children of Israel, and go serve the Lord, as ye have said, &c." Ex. 12 : 30—32. Simultaneously with the emancipation of the Hebrews from the evils and the wrongs of a grievous bondage, commenced the era of their national elevation and political importance ; their remarkable civil and religious institutions ; their spiritual regeneration, and moral pre-eminence. Soon after this period, date too, many of those religious ceremonies and sacrificial rites, which, under certain conditions, were not only to possess expiatory efficacy, but be also at the same time, *emblematical* of a future ; a more comprehensive, and a more excellent expiation—the *redemption* through Jesus Christ.

#### *The Jewish Passover, in its Original and in its Modified Form.*

First, in its original form. It has already been stated, that the history of the institution of the annual festival of the Jews, known as the Passover, is recorded in the XII chapter of the Book of Exodus ; it is reiterated in the IX chapter of the Book of Numbers, both as to its obligatory nature, and the mode of its observance. Originally, it ap-

pears to have been celebrated with comparatively few rites, and to have consisted in only a small number of *festal elements*. The lamb, or rather its flesh, the unleavened bread, cakes, and the bitter herbs, are the substances, according to the text, which composed the essential ingredients of the festive board, of the primitive Passover, as it was celebrated in Egypt. They will receive farther explanation, by a reference to the original Hebrew. The lamb—*seh*: “One of the smaller cattle, a sheep or goat.” Custom, as far as can be ascertained, among the Jews, in the subsequent period of the Church, decides in favor of the young of the sheep—the *lamb*, though the Hebrew term equally admits a rendering into the young of the goat—the *kid*. The unleavened bread, *matzah*:\* “Something unleavened; pressed together; close, heavy; in opposition to what is leavened or light.” In the singular, with the adjective, Lev. 8:26, it is *hhallath matzath*, unleavened *cake*, and in the plural, Num. 6:15, *hhulloth matzoth*, unleavened *cakes*. Instead of bread, therefore, cake in the singular, and cakes in the plural, are the proper translations of the Hebrew. Besides the thin cake, of a figure resembling a *soda-cracker*, only larger, still called *matzah*, as it was in remote antiquity, and emphatically the paschal cake, is sufficient proof that *matzah* is cake, and not bread, in the sense in which Occidental nations employ the term. The bitter herbs—*merorim*, *bitter herbs*, used only in the plural.†

A few remarks, relative to the design of the paschal institution, and the manner after which it was celebrated, may here be introduced. The blood of the paschal lamb, was stained, by means of a *bunch of hyssop*, on the lintels and posts of the door-ways of the houses. The object of these designative badges was, that seeing them, “The Lord would pass over the door, and not suffer the destroyer to enter the houses and smite the inhabitants.” The blood of the lamb was, therefore, indirectly of a propitiatory character, it saved. The lamb, after it was dressed, was to be prepared for the table, by being *roasted*, after which it was eaten with the unleavened cakes and bitter herbs. Every *household*, if it was large enough, had a lamb to itself, if not, some neighbors made up the deficiency; for the in-

\* The eighteenth letter of the Hebrew alphabet, *Tzadhe*, is usually, and, perhaps, more properly, represented by *Tz*, instead as here by *Tz*.

† “And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage.” Ex. 1:14.

tention was, that nothing should remain. If, however, it so happened that a part of it was left unconsumed, it had to be burned before morning, as was the case with the remains of thank-offerings generally. For, though in the history of the institution of the Passover, our English version of the Bible, speaks of a *sacrifice* indefinitely, the original *zebahh pesahh* denotes the paschal thank-offering: the later customs of the Jews, as we shall see hereafter, clearly verify this construction. The Jews were ever to be only thankful for their wonderful preservation amid the execution of Jehovah's awful judgments upon the Egyptians, and they were, hence, annually to observe the celebration of the Passover: first, as an evidence of undying *gratitude*, and, secondly, as a perpetual *memorial*. These facts are plainly taught in Ex. 12, 14 : 26, 27 verses. In the fourteenth verse, the Lord speaks thus: "And this day shall be unto you for a *memorial*." This day: the fourteenth of the month Nisan, the anniversary of the institution of the Passover. In the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh verses, the additional reason for the observance of the Passover festival, is stated in these words: "And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? That ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, &c." The Passover festival, therefore, is reminiscent, a memorial. The Jews celebrated it, in remembrance of the first Passover in Egypt. It is a thank-offering festival, or thanksgiving sacrifice; for the *destroyer* had passed over them—salvation had been vouchsafed to them.

Secondly, in its modified form. In this division, relating to the festival of the Passover, we shall find much that will corroborate what has been already said, as well as considerable additional matter, and, therefore, we must expect the Passover both to assume new features, and to be clothed with new interest. I notice first, that according to the ritual usages, common in thank-offerings, among the Jews, the fat of the lamb was burned on the altar, as a sacrifice, or an offering of thanksgiving to the Lord. Before proceeding farther, I desire to avow myself under obligation, in this part of my treatise, to Lundius, the erudite author of the "*Alten Juedischen Heilighuemer*." Having performed this simple act of justice, I remark, it may be observed that the paschal cakes, the unleavened bread, *were broken*, and then distributed among the guests, because, being hard

and brittle, they could more readily be broken, than divided in any other way ; the breaking of them, however, had no reference to a breaking of any part of the lamb's body ; for not a "bone of it was to be broken." Hence, the custom of breaking the bread, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, cannot be meant, as is commonly supposed, to be an allusion to a breaking of the Saviour's body on the cross, because no part of *his* body was broken. I add, that the Jews were in the habit of calling the roasted flesh of the paschal lamb, *the body of the Passover: basar*, according to Gesenius, signifies both body and flesh. It must, therefore, have been common among the Passover guests, to use the word *basar* in this twofold sense ; as the body of the Passover, the flesh of the Passover, &c., meaning the body, or flesh of the lamb, which was merely a symbol of the original Passover lamb, which could not be *eaten*, but only commemorated. Wine, also, was finally introduced into the paschal celebration, and the guests partook freely, though, doubtless, as pious Israelites, moderately of it, using several goblets on this happy, jubilant occasion. What is especially to be commended, and is worthy of the general imitation of mankind, is the profound gratitude with which the Passover festival was observed, or every part of it enjoyed, with souls overflowing with thankfulness and praise. Before the flesh of the lamb, the wine, or the cakes, were used by the participants of the feast, the father of the family, or some one appointed to officiate in his stead, pronounced a suitable blessing, or in other words, solemnly offered up thanks to God, the adorable "giver of every good and perfect gift." Six psalms were *statedly* employed, at the Passover festival, to resound the grateful praises of the devout Jews, and known under the title of *Hallel-psalms*, or psalms of praise. They were designed to express more generally, and at distinct intervals of the feast, the praises and thanksgivings, adapted to the occasion. They comprised the group, beginning with the one hundred and thirteenth, and ending with the one hundred and eighteenth psalms. They were sometimes only read by the celebrant, but generally they were sung in full chorus. To each element, or ingredient of the Passover Supper, a special benediction, or *grace* was appropriated. A few examples of thanksgiving, or praise, pronounced before the cakes, bread, in its widest sense, and wine were distributed, may here be inserted : "Blessed art thou, O

Lord, our God, King of the world! who provides us with bread from the earth." In the case of the wine, the host said: "All thy works, O Lord! do praise thee. Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God, King of the world! who hast created the fruit of the vine." Here we find no instance of a conversion, or transmutation of the paschal *elements*: they are simply treated as gifts of God, for which thanks and praises are devoutly offered up. Nor is there a *consecration*. Only thanksgiving, praise, that is all. I shall now proceed to point out the symbolical, or emblematical significations of the paschal elements, or ingredients. The flesh or body of the lamb was a symbol, only a symbol of the Passover lamb. The blood of the lamb, not being used in the festival of the Passover, it being poured at the foot of the altar, wine—red wine, unless it could not be had, was employed to symbolize the blood of the first Passover lamb, stained on the posts and lintels of the door-ways of the Hebrew habitations. Therefore, neither the flesh was the body, nor the wine the blood, of the primitive paschal lamb, but only a memorial, or representative sign. As to the unleavened cakes, bread, they were to remind the successive generations of the Jewish nation, of the haste, in which their ancestors left Egypt, not having time to leaven their *matzah*, before they were baked. They are also an inferior species of bread, indicative of poverty and a low state of civilization, and, therefore well calculated to symbolize their degraded condition in Egypt. Hence, they were wont to call them, the *bread of affliction*. Of the bitter herbs, it has already been stated, that they were designed to be emblematical of their former bitter state of bondage.

*The Institution and Elucidation of The Lord's Supper.*

I. The institution of the Lord's Supper. It was in the ominous and ever memorable night, preceding his painful but meritorious death, just one thousand five hundred and twenty-four years and a half after its institution, on the banks of the Nile, that our Lord, in company with his apostles, once more, and for the last time, celebrated the ancient and extraordinary anniversary festival of the *chosen people*—the Jewish Passover.\* The little band of

\* In this calculation, it is supposed that Jesus was thirty-three years and six months old, at the time of his crucifixion.

Christians, headed by the blessed Founder of the New Testament dispensation, ate and drank, at the paschal Supper, conformably to long established usage, in compliance with the Divine requirements, and in memory of the first Passover celebration in Egypt, the prototype, or model of all future Passovers. At last, in closing the paschal feast, they sang a psalm, as was customary, the farewell psalm, to a past epoch of time. How its tones must have trembled, and lingered, and clogged, on the lips, which should never more, as they had often been wont to do, sing sweet *hallel-psalms*, or utter joyous *hallelujah-refrains*. Jesus, at this critical moment, stood on the extreme confines of the ritual institutions, and civil polity of the Jewish nation: the Old Testament economy. It was an instance of time, in which a new order of things in the history of human experience, was to be inaugurated, and in signs and acts, ever to be held sacred, by all future generations.

The words of the institution of the Lord's Supper, to which the reader's attention is now invited, are recorded with slight textual variations, in the first three books of the New Testament, and in the eleventh chapter of the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. I shall transcribe them here, in the order in which they succeed each other. Matthew 26: 26—28: "And as they were eating," still partaking of the Passover, "Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins." Mark 14: 22—24: "And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and, when he had given thanks, he gave it to them; and they did all drink of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many." Luke 22: 19—20: "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body, which is given for you: do this in remembrance of me. Likewise, also the cup, after the Supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you." Paul: "The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you:

this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner, also, he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me; for as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death, till he come." Reference having been made, by the Saviour, to his second advent, and a hymn of praise and thanksgiving sung, the first communicants of the *Lord's table*, retired to Mount Olive. Thus, was instituted, and, for the first time celebrated, the Christian Passover, or Lord's Supper.

II. The elucidation of the Lord's Supper. The points of interest, which alone are essential in this investigation, in order to unfold the true sense, and thus render intelligible the undoubted design of the words and phrases, are contained in the sacramental institution of the Lord's Supper. Accordingly, attention is invited to the distinct and emphatic enunciations. The bread, this is my body; the wine, this is my blood, or my blood of the New Testament; the cup, this cup is the New Testament in my blood; do this in remembrance of me, the injunction is twice repeated, according to St. Paul, as often as you eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye do *show forth the Lord's death till he come*; the bread and the wine; Jesus offered up thanks for them, or pronounced a blessing upon them, that is, praised God for these inestimable gifts.

In view of these facts, I observe, that the bread and wine, which the Saviour used at the celebration of the first Lord's Supper, were paschal bread and wine. This is a point of grave moment. For, if the bread and wine, are to be considered as literally denoting the body and blood of our Lord, then it follows clearly that the Lord's Supper is not an altogether new institution, and that the Jews had already, for many ages anterior to the institution of the Lord's Supper, celebrated this sacrament, or commemorative rite. In the observance of the Passover, the bread and wine occupied a prominent place, in consequence of their great symbolical significance. Christ simply transferred these elements to his new institution, where they continued to express a similar symbolic, or emblematic significance, modified merely in so far as they became the representative signs of new relations, or different purposes. Their character, or nature is not in the least altered, and their functions are virtually the same. These pro-

positions must appear still more evident, when we bear in mind the fact, that the Saviour did not perform any liturgical act, which could have wrought a conversion, or transmutation of the bread and wine into any other substance, or entity; for he only made them the objects of blessing or thanksgiving, that is, he gave praise to God for them, *he did not consecrate them*, or confer on them fundamentally new natures and attributes, but only assigned them to a new relation, with the old mnemonic functions unimpaired. Even his benediction, at the use of the bread and wine, was an imitation, or adoption of the practice observed among the Jews, at their Passover celebration. It was the *special* invocation of a blessing upon *each separate course* of the feast: the concise, general formula of praise and thanksgiving had already been announced, and, as it seems, was regarded by our Lord, as entirely satisfactory. Jesus says of the sacramental bread, the Passover *matzah*, This is my body. This phraseology, I conceive, cannot mean the personal entity of the Saviour, his individual being, or identity; for this would involve a solecism, nay, a flat contradiction of the plainest and most reliable evidence of our senses, because "it is impossible," according to a universally recognized axiom, "for the same thing to be, and not to be." Hence, if bread is bread, as its name and use imply, and a distinct entity, it cannot, at the same time, be the body of our Saviour, and he cannot have intended that it should be so considered. The same argument holds equally true, in respect to the wine, in its relation to the blood of Jesus. Again, as the flesh or body of the annual paschal lamb, was not the first or original Passover lamb, or, in other words, identical with it, but only a symbol or representative sign of it; so the bread, primarily, the very same bread, which was used in the paschal feast, in the Lord's Supper, is not Christ, or his body, but only the symbol of him, in his divine capacity of Saviour, the index, pointing towards "the lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world." Nor could the Jews, when they employed wine in the celebration of the Passover, have the remotest idea, that it was actually the blood of the primitive paschal lamb, shed on the night of the institution of the Passover, and stained on the lintels and posts of the door-ways of the habitations of their ancestors; the possibility of such a thought, implies a lack, or renunciation of common sense; but simply the sign or emblem of

the blood of the first Passover lamb. When, therefore, the Saviour declares the wine to be his blood, or the blood of the New Testament, he cannot wish to be understood literally, but metaphorically, and to mean that it *denotes* his blood, which he was about to shed, in introducing a new dispensation of grace, and, that hence, the sacramental wine is only symbolic, or indicative of his blood, thus applied and defined.\*

The following striking facts, can hardly fail to elevate the fore-going remarks and illustrations to the rank and force of demonstrative proof. These facts are the command of our Lord, "Do this in remembrance of me," a command, which, according to St. Paul, he twice enjoined, during the administration of the Lord's Supper; and his assurance, *For as often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death, till he come.*" These phraseologies are plain, forcible, decisive. The Lord's Supper, as far as bread and wine are constituent parts in its organic structure, is clearly reminiscent, or commemorative; it *shows* the Lord's death, that is, commemorates its cause and effect, or symbolizes it in the eucharistic use of bread and wine, as representative signs or emblems of the body and blood of Jesus; that is, of himself, as dying and dead. Again and lastly, I ask, how can the eating and drinking of the bread and wine, or the cake and wine, in remembrance of Jesus, be synonymous with an actual and literal eating and drinking of the Saviour's body and blood; that is, of himself, and yet be done in *remembrance* of him? For I remember what is past, and, therefore, absent, not what I possess in impending time, and which is, of course, present. To deny this, is to confound intuition with memory; the past with the present; and the impartial verdict of the reason and ex-

---

\* It may be observed here, that it was almost universally customary among the nations of antiquity, to confirm compacts, or covenants, with blood, or blood and wine mixed. "The wine used on this occasion," at the institution of the Lord's Supper, writes Burder, in his *Oriental Customs*, "was an emblem and representation of the blood of Christ, about to be shed for the remission of sins. It was usual even among the heathens to make and confirm their covenants by drinking human blood, and that sometimes mixed with wine."

perience of mankind, with blind credulity, or wilful rejection of truth.

*Preliminary Observations on Metaphorical Language, briefly Illustrated by Examples.*

Though the language of tropes, or in other words, of figurative language, is as Blair writes, "a deviation from what may be reckoned the most simple form of speech," it is "to be accounted part of that language which nature dictates to men." The Scriptures abound in rich and varied figurative language, the flowers and spices of articulate utterance, and, especially, in metaphor, at once, the most commanding, concise, and elegant style of oratory. It always implies an ellipsis, a figure of speech, by which one or more words are omitted, a fact, which the mind, at least, must recognize, otherwise it will be deceived and forced to false inference; false exegesis; and, what is worse than all, false doctrines. Thus, to illustrate the preceding remarks, by a few examples, deemed pertinent to the subject, the paschal lamb is *elliptically* often called the Passover, instead of the sign, or memorial of the Passover; yet, no one, acquainted with the origin and history of this celebrated rite, and endowed with a common share of intelligence, will infer from this summary style of speaking, that the lamb of the Passover, was either the Lord himself, or the *destroying* angel, mercifully passing by, or over, the blood-stained habitations of the departing Hebrews, while he smote every first-born offspring, in the doomed land of Egypt. The Psalmist, in the sweet and lofty strains of lyric song, and the lively enthusiasm of a fervid piety, calls God, *a rock, a fortress, a buckler, a horn, and a high tower*. Now take this language *literally*, and be sure, that being so taken, it is true, and there is an end—pardon the thought, Thou Great *I am!*—of God; of providence; and, sooner or later, as soon as the present order of things should cease, of the universe. Hence, we see how stupendous a folly it is, and how appalling are the consequences, which must result from a practice, as vicious as it is unphilological, to interpret metaphorical expressions literally. All that the royal poet designed, by this grand, figurative portraiture of the relation of the Supreme Being to him, was to express, in strong and ardent language, the outpouring of the heart-thoughts, the greatness, the power, and the goodness of his divine and gracious Bene-

factor. Jesus declares, *I am the way, and the truth, and the life.* What import is to be attached to these propositions, considering that this is metaphorical language, and that Jesus, though the Son of God, and the Saviour of mankind, cannot be, at the same time, an abstraction and a concrete existence? That Jesus is a *way*, in the common acceptation of the term, and, therefore, synonymous with road, who can be so silly as to believe it? Nor can he be supposed to be a way, in the sense of a method of life and conduct, or truth and life, in their ethic abstraction, without concrete relations and attributes, without contradiction and self-stultification. By such phraseology, the Saviour can only mean to say, that he is Divinely appointed to direct mortals to the way, in which they should walk, or according to which they should live, and, that it is he, who, in an eminent degree, communicates to us the God-appointed truths and means, necessary to salvation. A fact, of the highest moment, in this investigation is, that at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the Saviour spoke neither in Greek nor Latin, but in the Chaldeo-Syriac language, common at that time, in Judea, and, which, like the Oriental languages generally, contains no terms which express the words *to mean, to signify, to denote, represent, symbolize, &c.*, and, that therefore, we have, and necessarily must have, metaphoric expressions in the Lord's Supper.

Secondly, additional examples of metaphorical language, in other parts of the Bible, and a reiteration of the reason for using such language, by our Saviour. Dr. Clarke, the erudite and able commentator, speaking of the passage, in the Lord's Supper, *This is my body*, proceeds thus: "Here, it must be observed, that Christ had nothing in his hands at this time, but part of that unleavened bread, which he and his disciples had been eating at Supper, and, therefore, he could mean no more than this, viz., that the bread which he was now breaking, *represented his body*, which, in the course of a few hours, was to be crucified for them. Common sense, unsophisticated with superstition and erroneous creeds; and reason, unawed by the secular sword of sovereign authority, could not possibly take any other meaning than this consistent and rational one, out of these words." "But," says a false and absurd creed, "Jesus meant, when he said, *hoc est corpus meum*, this is my body, and *hic est calix sanguinis mei*, this is the chalice of my blood, that the bread and wine were *substantially changed*

into his body, including flesh, blood, bones, yea, the whole Christ, in his immaculate humanity and adorable divinity!" And, for denying this, what rivers of righteous blood have been shed by state persecutions, and by religious wars! Well, it may be asked, "Can any man of sense believe, that when Christ took up that bread, and broke it, that it was his own body which he held in his own hands, and which he himself broke to pieces, and which he and his disciples ate?" He who can believe such a congeries of absurdities, cannot be said to be a *volunteer in faith*; for it is evident, the man can have neither faith nor reason, as to this subject.

Besides, our Lord did not say, *hoc est corpus meum*—this is my body, as he did not speak in the Latin tongue; though as much stress has been laid upon this question from the Vulgate, as if the original of the three evangelists had been written in the Latin language. Had he spoken in Latin, following the idiom of the Vulgate, he would have said, *Panis hic corpus meum significat*, or *symbolum est corporis mei*; *hoc poculum sanguinem meum representat*, or *symbolum est sanguinis mei*: This bread signifies my body, this cup represents my blood. But let it be observed, that in the Hebrew, Chaldee, Chaldeo-Syriac languages, there is no term which expresses to *mean*, *signify*, *denote*, though both the Greek and Latin abound with them. Hence, the Hebrews use a figure, and say, *it is*, for *it signifies*. So Gen. 41:26—27; The seven kine *are*—represent, seven years. This *is*—represents, the bread of affliction which our fathers ate in the land of Egypt. Daniel 7:24; The ten horns *are*—signify, ten kings. They drank of the *spiritual Rock* which followed them, and the Rock was—represented, Christ, 1 Cor. 10:4. And following this Hebrew idiom, though the work is written in Greek, we find in Rev. I:20; The seven stars *are*—represent, the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks *are*—represent, the seven churches. The same form of speech is used in a variety of places in the New Testament, where this sense must necessarily be given to the word. Matthew 13:38—39; The field *is*—represents, the world; the good seed *are*—represent or signify, the children of the kingdom; the tares *are*—signify, the children of the wicked one; the enemy *is*—signifies the devil; the harvest *is*—represents, the end of the world; and the reapers *are*—signify, the angels.

Tertullian, against Marcion, C. 40, seems to have had a correct notion of those words of our Lord, *Accipitum panem, et distributum discipulis, corpus illum suum fecit hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est figura corporis mei*: having taken the bread, and distributed *that body* to his disciples, he made it *his body*, by saying, This is my body, that is, a *figure* of my body.

That our Lord neither spoke in Greek or Latin, on this occasion, needs no proof. It was, most probable, in what was formerly called the Chaldaic, now the Syriac, that our Lord conversed with his disciples. Through the providence of God, we have complete versions of the Gospels in this language; and in them, it is likely, we have the precise words spoken by our Lord, on this occasion. In Matth. 26 : 26—27 the words in the Syriac version are, *Hanan pagree*: this is my body; *hanan demee*: this is my blood, of which forms of speech, the Greek is a verbal translation; nor would any man, even in the present day, speaking in the same language, use among the people to whom it was vernacular, other terms than the above to express, This represents my body, and This represents my blood.

But this form of speech is common, even in our own language; though we have terms enough to fill up the ellipsis. Suppose a man entering into a museum, enriched with the remains of ancient Greek sculpture, his eyes are attracted by a number of curious busts; and, on inquiring what they are, he learns, this is Socrates, that Plato, a third Homer, others are Hesiod, Horace, Virgil, Demosthenes, Cicero, Herodotus, Livy, Cæsar, Nero, Vespasian, &c. Is he deceived by this information? Not at all; he knows well that the busts he sees, are not the *identical persons* of those ancient philosophers, poets, orators, historians, and emperors, but only *representations* of their persons in sculpture, between which and the original, there is as essential a difference, as between a human body, instinct with all the principles of rational vitality, and a block of marble. When, therefore, Christ took a piece of bread, brake it, and said, This is my body, who, but the most stupid of mortals could imagine, that he was, at the same time, handling and breaking his own body! Would not any person, of plain common sense, see as great a difference between the *man* Christ Jesus, and the piece of bread, as between the bust of marble and the philosopher it repre-

resented, in the case it referred to above? The truth is, there is scarcely a more common form of speech in any language, than *this is*, for, *this represents, or signifies, &c.*

Truth, lovely gift of heaven! is mighty, and should, ah, must prevail. It crowns with honor and glory him, that honestly and fearlessly seeks it; for he shall find it!

#### ARTICLE VI.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF DR. J. T. BECK, PROF. OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF TUBINGEN.

By Rev. E. J. WOLF, A. M., Baltimore, Md.

The conception of a Christian Church, or communion, in its primitive or genuine sense, is original with the New Testament. Its ideal is not the outgrowth of the human mind, nor does society anywhere offer a similitude, except in the economy of the Old Testament, in the domain of revelation. There are elsewhere, it is true, religious associations, external alliances consisting of larger or smaller numbers, there are unions of a general religious character and for religious ends, but if we conceive the Christian Church to be purely, or chiefly, a religious association, and thence attempt to distinguish it from other religious societies, we at once lose sight of the peculiar character of the Christian Church, which constitutes its idea of a communion.

That peculiar character is not determined by a common external participation in certain forms: the first congregation had, in this respect, the preaching of the Word, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, all of which, falling in with the *Temple-cultus* still in vogue, connected themselves with the existing Judaism, yet there, already we read of an *εκκλησία* as distinct from Judaism, while on the other hand, repeated warnings are given in the Epistles, against sundry persons who were members of the Christian association, but who over-against the *εκκλησία* are designated *τεινοί*, and it is commanded to keep separate from these, and not to

acknowledge them as members of the congregation. The idea of an association does, therefore, not coincide with that of a Christian communion, 2 Tim. 2:9—21; Phil. 3:17; Matth. 18:36; Luke 18:25.

1. In its objective relation, the idea of the Church, in the Old and New Testament, is essentially determined by the peculiar nature of the kingdom of God, whose organ the Church is, and the kingdom of God is not only distinguished from the world and its religious organizations, but is diametrically opposed to them; in its subjective relation, by the equally peculiar character of the children of God, who, likewise, are distinct from, and opposed to, all the rest of the world and its religious constituents. Thus, combined with the idea of the kingdom of God, and that of the Sonship of God's people, the Church of Christ takes in an order of conceptions, facts, and principles, entirely different from those, with which it is wont to appear in the religious associations of the world. It does not rest upon the plan of a human founder of religion, nor of a human administration, but upon the divine plan of redemption, as achieved by the atonement for the world, and the outpouring of the Spirit through the incarnation of the Son of God. For its constant advancement and final triumph, it is by no means dependent upon a human doctrinal development, or tendency, but on the word of the Spirit, which has neither been drawn from human consciousness, nor can it be circumscribed by any Confessional Symbolization, but which embraces and reveals purely and clearly the whole plan of redemption. This word of the Spirit, at the same time a spiritual government, which, until He shall appoint his own to reign with Him at his second coming (Matth. 19:28; Rev. 3:21;) recognizes one being, as its sole sovereign Lord, namely: the divine Son of Man, exalted to God's right hand. And this divine government, as administered by the sole occupant of the throne, is carried on in constant unison with the Eternal word; His reign is characterized by grace and judgment, not the one without the other, and the end to be realized is, the formation of a Church with a divine temple of the Spirit, into a spiritual body of Christ. Eph. 2:20; 1:22.

These are the Scriptural foundations. Any assault upon these, any attempted change of these divine principles and facts, any tampering with these divine means and ends, any putting aside, or altering a single one of them, is

shown by the biblical conception of the Church, to be an encroachment upon the jurisdiction of the highest Monarch, in His sovereignty of Creator, Law-giver and King; it is high treason. Such efforts violate the name and nature of the Christian Church, they undermine its pillars, and frustrate its aim; they narrow the blessed channels, through which flows the transcendent power of God; they grasp the shadow instead of the substance.

The Church of Christ is, accordingly, no mere human society, either in the form of an independent religious association, or of a politico-religious institution. It does not merely gather spiritual teachers, and the citizens of a community into a peculiar relation, or a collective religious body, but it comprises children of God, animated by his Spirit, and citizens of the kingdom inwardly controlled by the divine law, who are united to their supermundane Sovereign, and to each other, not by a common *Cultus*, but by a spiritual and living communion.

The bond of fellowship is so peculiar and unique, that among all human relations and associations, none furnishes a parallel, save marriage and family relation. Eph. 5 : 28—33 ; 8 : 15. An organic union, therefore, is the basis. Representations drawn from earthly government and dominion, belong to the Church's future, as affected by the second coming of Christ. What distinguishes and elevates the family bond is this, that it is of divine origin. It is no mere external fellowship, or human development for useful ends. The marriage relation owes neither its origin, nor its perpetuation to human ordinances, or legislative enactments, or any mechanical, or statutory provisions. It is the relation of nature, a communion of love, arising from nature. Marriage, as it should be, is an organic condition, embracing the whole being in body and soul; it is the personal conjunction of body and soul, between man and wife, arising from, or after the manner of the flesh, *κατὰ σάρκα*. A similar personal reciprocal union, according to Scripture, exists between Christ and his Church, after the manner of the Spirit, *κατὰ πνεῦμα*.

The conditions to a union, in both instances, arise from an inward necessity, namely, so far as man and woman, even as Christ and men, according to their actual constitution, are adapted and fitted for each other, Coll. 1 : 16; John 1 : 4—11; Eph. 5 : 30. This inward necessity, however, produces no compulsion, voluntary faith and volun-

tary love, an optional, uncoerced choice brings and keeps together man and woman, Christ and his people. Again, as the marriage state, by means of generation and propagation produces, not a society merely, but a family of kindred, a household whose members are bound together by kindred dispositions, and united to each other in nature's bond of love, as children, as brothers and sisters, so the true bridal union with Christ, by the generation and propagation of the Spirit, gathers a family of God, whose members are born of the same spiritual seed, partakers of the same divine nature, forming not an artificial and mechanical, but a natural, organic, community of children and brethren, and, as such, they enjoy the immunities and prerogatives of God's household, while those, who are mere servants, or even bastards, though in the family, externally connected with it, and arrogating to themselves all manner of power, can only receive a brief and temporary tolerance without any claims, or inheritance as heirs, 1 Pet. 1: 22; 2 Pet. 1: 8; Matth. 23: 8; Gal. 3: 28; 4: 7, 29; John 8: 35. This is the only analogy to the Church, derived from the relations of human society.

3. Other analogies are taken from the domain of external nature. These, again, have nothing to do with any artificial arrangements of man, but are found in the organic sphere of creation, evincing spontaneity, nature, law and design. One similitude is furnished by the rock, with the stricture erected out of, and upon it, an example of strength, system and durability, Matth. 7: 24; 10: 18; Eph. 2: 20—22; 1 Cor. 8: 10—15; 1 Pet. 2: 4—8.

Another analogy is furnished by the seed, with the plant springing from it, pointing to the Church's growth and development from within, Mark 4: 26; Matth. 13: 38; 1 Pet. 1: 23; Matth. 15: 18; 1 Cor. 3: 6—9; others, by the vine with its branches, the body consisting of head and members, relating to the internal nature and power of this communion, John 15: 1—6; 1 Cor. 12: 12. The rock, the seed, the vine, the Head, all these proceed purely from God, not in any wise from man. They represent Jesus Christ, in his peculiar person, in his own Spirit, word, and work. To add anything to this, or take anything from it, is an attack upon the foundations of the Church; it is doing violence to its very essence; it is sinning against the Head and Spirit, producing disorder and

ruin. The building and joining together, on the other hand, the sowing, planting, developing, is neither wholly the work of God, nor of man, but men are to coöperate with God, to be co-workers with Him, always, however, in such a way, that the human will not hinder or control the divine, but obey it and serve it, in such a way that God alone, in Jesus Christ, will have the honor of Creator and Lord, of Author and Finisher. God, in and through Christ, gives all things, and determines all things. From Him, and from Him alone, men are to seek and draw whatsoever is needed. They must aim at His glory, and surrender themselves to His will, if they would receive anything at His hand, and, that which is received must not be mixed with any foreign additions, but is to be used, dispensed and improved, in constant dependence upon the Lord. 1 Peter 4:10; 2 Cor. 2:17; Coll. 2:6—10, 18; Eph. 3:14—21; Lev. 6:46—49; Rev. 22:11—14.

#### *The Establishment and Genetic Development of the Church.*

*Preliminary Remarks.* The name "Church," the etymology of which is still undecided, is not of Scriptural origin. It belongs to an historical development, in which Christians formed themselves into a politico-religious association. The use of the term has been productive of immense mischief. It has been employed in the most arbitrary manner, to designate, now an abstraction, then a reality, at one time an ideal, at another an empirical thing, surrounding the subject with error, disorder and confusion, causing evermore the return of the question, "What is the Church," or in reference to the different empirical Churches, the question, "Which is the true Church?" In answer to this, again, that which belongs only to the true Church of Christ, is attributed to some particular "Church," without regard to its spiritual, or moral condition, and independent of its relation to the true Church universal. Or, in order that some particular "Church" may be secured as the true Church, the term is employed in such a manner, that by it, we are not to understand a number of particular individuals of a peculiar character, but a set of institutions, ordinances, forms and symbols. These will constitute the persons participating in them, into a true Church! Finally, a singular contradiction exposes itself, in this matter, among the New Theologians, who boast of having discovered, that the Holy Scriptures are

not the the Word of God, but that the Word of God is in the Scriptures, while on the other hand, the true *Ecclesia* of Christ, is not only found within the empirical Church, but this empirical Church is the true Church, invested with all its authority and power! It would be difficult to decide which of these views is the more unchristian and ungodly. What God has joined together, let no man put asunder. But, what man has joined together, in the unholy mixtures which, in too many cases, constitute "the Church," let no one dare to invest with the title, the privileges, the authority of the Church of the Lord Jesus.

1. *Historical Account of the Name and Conception of the Church.* The Christian Church connects with the Church of the Old Testament, which is called ἡγένετο ἡγένετο ἡγένετο, translated by the Seventy, sometimes ἐκκλησία, sometimes ἐκκλησίαι, I Mac. 4 : 59. The O. T. Church, already, is called an "Ecclesia," not as a mere gathering, or assembly, but as a gathering, or congregation, chosen and selected from the rest of mankind, a people, a communion, chosen and gathered by God, to be His peculiar people. Gen. 32 : 2 ; 8 ; Ps. 74 : 2.

Both Churches, that of the Old, and that of the New Covenant, were founded by a divine act ; they are not the work of man, they are a divine creation. The Christian Church is, however, the completion or consummation of the O. T. Church. Their being founded of God, and belonging to God, which both have in common, is accomplished for the Christian Church, by a divine act of atonement encompassing eternity, and by the communication of the Holy Ghost. So, too, the election, common to both, is in the N. T. Church, no longer confined to one nation externally separated from the rest of the world, but the call extends to all the earth, and men are chosen from every nation under heaven. Possessing this elective character, consisting of a chosen people, the N. T. Church in its immediate origin, is called ἐκκλησία, from ἐκκλησία. This term designates the totality of those composing an individual, local, congregation, as well as the entire membership of Christ's Church. 1 Cor. 1 : 2 ; Eph. 1 : 22. Its external union does not derive its character, or form, from the *Cultus of the Temple*, but from that of the Synagogue. The name ἐκκλησία used both of the Jewish houses of prayer, and the assemblies held in them, is transferred to the

Christian Church, Ja. 2 : 2. In Heb. 10 : 25, the Christian assembly, in distinction from the Jewish Synagogue, is called *ιατρεῖς ἴδιον συναγωγὴν*, "their own, particular assembly," which had begun to be neglected, by some who were under Judaizing influences. The completion of the O. T. *Temple Cultus* is reserved for the time of Christ's future coming. The Temple-idea has, for the present, only a spiritual significance in the Christian Church. Eph. 2 : 22 ; 1 Pet. 2 : 5 ; Heb. 13 : 10, 13—15. The Jews, regarding themselves *par excellence*, the *συναγωγὴ*, Christians are spoken of and treated as *Αποστάτας*, but that which marks the Church's distinction from Judaism, is the designation *εκκλησία Θεοῦ*, 1 Cor. 1 : 2 ; 10 : 32 ; 1 Tim. 3 : 15. As such, however, as *εκκλησία Θεοῦ*, the Church from its very start, asks no recognition as a particular organization or political corporation. Its adherents are everywhere regarded as *λατρεῖδον*, as *διασπορά*, 1 Pet. 1, 2 : 11 ; James 1 : 1 ; Phil. 3 : 20. The realization of the idea of a political corporation, like that of the Temple, is reserved for the new *εών* when the Christocracy shall appear as World-Sovereignty, with peculiar kings and priests.

The word *εκκλησία*, used of Jewish political or worshiping assemblies, is prophetically employed by Christ in Matt. 16 : 18, to designate the communion he was about to establish. The word here, according to the context, signifies, the adherents, disciples, subjects of the kingdom of heaven, as they are constituted by faith in Christ, as the Son of the living God and united to each other in his name. Matt. 16 : 18 ; 18 : 18, 20 cf. 17.

As an accomplished fact, the *εκκλησία* is first mentioned in Acts 2 : 47. The import and nature of this title is there established by sundry acts of *ελεύθερον*, to wit: the divine *προσκαλεσι* (v. 39) the divine call to salvation through Christ and the individual application of it; the apostolic *παρακαλεσι* (v. 40) a call involving separation from the mass (this untoward generation); this is followed in the subject by a voluntary calling upon the name of the Lord *επικαλεσι* (v. 21). It is by this process that the soul gains admission into the economy of grace in Christ, v. 41 : 47 cf. 21. And these acts of the *ελεύθερον*: the divine *προσον*, \* \* \* the *παρακαλεσι*—*ἀνδε τῆς γενναῖς ταυτῆς*, which is the same as *εκκλησία*, and the corresponding *παρακαλεσι* as the human and subjective act—not, therefore, the mere external hearing of the word and external baptismal fellowship—furnish the true con-

ception of the "ecclesia," in its etymological and historical root. The Church in its construction appears neither as a purely objective fact, as simply a divine institution, nor as a purely subjective thing, a human association, but, primarily the divine objective enters into a definite relation with the human subjectivity, by means of *καταστάσις*, and the subjective enters into a corresponding relation with the divine objectivity, by means of *αποδεκτίσθαι τὸν λόγον*, not immediately by means of *βασιλικόθεα*. The Church, therefore, comes into being with the objective and subjective, thus combined through the medium of a believing *κοινωνίαθεα*.

It consists, as it is likewise designated, Act. 4 : 32, of "the multitude of them that believe,"<sup>11</sup> of the congregation of believers. (Aug. Con. Art. VII.) All these words and ideas, however, find their fixed and definite meaning in the historical Christ. Jesus, who is both "Lord and Christ," is the historical and fundamental groundwork of the Christian Church. Act. 2 : 36, 38, 41. He is not to be viewed as merely the reflex of Christian consciousness, or the outgrowth of it; a Christian consciousness is immanent in Christ, and can proceed only from him. The specific consciousness of the New Testament, is not produced by the general Messianic idea of Judaism. It is realized as the product of that, which the Messiah, as he manifested himself in Jesus, *is, has done and suffered*—as the product of his peculiar personality and history.

Nor must the fact be overlooked, that Christ, in the unfolding of his personal activity, with the adherence of the people, yea, even Jesus, with the circle of his disciples, does not yet constitute a Christian Church. The Church was not founded until His Messianic personality and activity had culminated in the atonement for the world, and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, and God's ancient word of prophecy, according to the spirit, if not the letter, had become a new word of the Spirit, and served as the "*διάκονος*," "ministry" of the atonement, and of the Holy Ghost. Luke. 24 : 44—49; Acts 2 : 16; 32 : 36, 38; 2 Cor. 5 : 18—20, &c.

When Christ had, in word, and deed, and spirit, finished and disclosed the work of Redemption, peculiar to, and immanent in, Him, as the one great and sole plan of salvation, and when the call of God in its divine power through Christ, to sunder men from out of the world, found immediate and cordial reception in their personal lives, then and

there the Church entered upon its existence. And in this, its historic inception, the Church of Christ presents itself to our view, as the totality of those, who by the same appropriation of the divine Gospel of Redemption, were made partakers of the salvation, and the spirit of Christ.

Inasmuch as the Christian conception of the Church, does not rest upon a purely objective divine foundation, but at the same time, upon a subjective human foundation of faith, the design of the Church demands, in addition to the objective and divine act, the planting and development of a state of faith in the subjects, corresponding to the divine objective; and this is accomplished by means of a school of faith, by the instruction and training of disciples. As Christ himself followed this course, so he expressly enjoins it upon His apostles. Matth. 28: 19; Mark 16: 15; Luke 24: 47.

This initiative instruction, this making of disciples, inculcating with deep earnestness and power, the elements of repentance and faith, this was the touch-stone, with which those, who had already been prepared for the Christian congregation, operated upon the mass of those who were as yet among the unprepared. The Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament was the elementary, preparatory book, the divine catechism, out of which, and by means of which, the apostolic Word, as well as the Word of Christ, was intended to lead them forward into Christian truth. 2 Tim. 3: 14; 2 Pet. 1: 19; Rom. 1: 1; 1 Cor. 15: 1. Along with the objective foundation which is laid in the divine fact of the Redemption, the additional, historical, fundamental basis of the Christian Church consists in the training of a discipleship, in a fostering, cultivating school of Christ. This is its *embryo development*. Its formal establishment is achieved by the preaching and belief of the accomplished redemption, and the reception of the Holy Spirit.

2. *Genetic Formation and Establishment of a Christian Church.* This consists of the training of a discipleship in a school of faith. This training, or education of disciples, according to the view which Christianity, without exception, gives of the universal condition of man, and of the world, has no more historical significance in the past, but it must be pursued everywhere on the depraved soil of human nature, and in the midst of a morally and spiritually degenerate society. It is the province and duty of

this disciple-school, to bring relief and deliverance from the corrupt condition of nature and society, by means of moral and religious transformation. For this end a mere external union, or an association, with a specific *Cultus* form will not suffice. The school of Christ requires spirit, moral cultivation, and spiritual training. It devolves upon this school first of all to impart instruction, an instruction resting upon the most general truths of the world's depravity, and of the divine kingdom, but always more specifically concentrating in the presentation of the person and redeeming work of Christ, in order to call forth a personal faith in him, as the personal Saviour. The great faith doctrines, therefore, as guiding to, and producing faith in, Jesus Christ, are the educational means to be employed in the disciple-school. These thoughts are drawn chiefly from the course, which the the Saviour himself pursued, and through which He fulfilled his promise: I will build a Church, against which the gates of Hell shall not prevail. The slow and cautious procedure of our Lord, is specially significant and admonitory for us on a soil, where, as among the Jews, the divine truths and ordinances, as well as a certain knowledge of Christ and his kingdom are indigenous, but have been traditionally weakened, and in part adulterated and perverted. His course serves as an exemplar, where an ecclesiastical form or system already exists. The more summary process of the apostles serves as a norm more particularly on a soil that has never been cultivated. Yet, here again, we must observe, no choice is left to us, and no deviation from their course is sanctioned, and that the congregations formed by them, have their origin in disciple associations. It is in the bounds of these, that the congregational organization is completed and matured. The title *μαθητας* in place of *εκκλησια* is employed in thirty different passages of the Acts of Apostles. The further *διδασκων* ("instruction") then of these disciples and their continuation in the *διδασκη* of the apostles led into the true Church-life of the congregations which had already been formed, but which still continued to draw the *μαθητας* into their bosom, in which they were to be improved and perfected. To such congregations the Epistles were addressed. Hence they, on the one hand, hold up the high prerogatives of the Church, on the other, they guard and warn it against coalitions and mixtures with

such evils as might yet cleave to the *μαθητας*. Hence arises, likewise, the distinction they make between weak and strong, between *ονκιος* and *τελειος*, between carnal and spiritual. The whole of them, however, through repentance and faith, *i. e.*, personal conversion, sundered themselves from the world and entered upon the way of the Lord. If in the course of time it became manifest, that this was not the case with some, recourse was had to discipline, and where this failed excommunication took place.

So far, then, as the congregational fellowship rests upon discipleship and the means of training employed by the latter are a *διδαχη*, and a *παραδοση*, we learn from the example and norm of Christ, the true manner of procedure in the formation of churches, anywhere and at all times. The existing ecclesiastical polities or religious systems were not attacked after a revolutionary fashion. An external overthrow of existing relations was in no way aimed at, neither was an external separation demanded of those adherents and disciples, who had been won. As little was the work, on the other hand, a conservative or restorative struggle, for the maintenance of what had once been established, in its temporary, or local narrowness, imperfection and weakness; still less, did any internal, or external disorder receive the slightest aid, or connivance, in the interests of conservatism; but the divine doctrine of the kingdom of heaven, with its inwardly emancipating and transforming truth, with its sharper severity and higher intensity of the law, with its earnest call to repentance, and with its blessedness and fruitfulness resulting from faith, continued from time to time, to be more fully and more specifically enforced. Through this course, there arose immediately a moral antithesis to the existing state of things, a moral antithesis of doctrine and of practice. And this in two directions: first, opposition to the binding force of external authority. This was the case with Christ and his apostles, in their connection with Judaism—which, itself rested upon divine institutions, and from which salvation was to proceed—within the circle, therefore, of correct doctrine, within the bounds of the Orthodox Church. The other form of opposition was, that which manifested itself against subjective arbitrariness, for instance, Saduceism, Temple-desecration, &c. This position, however, was taken and maintained, not by mechanical, or forcible measures, nor by dogmatizing formulas, but by means of a

moral and spiritual verdict, by the power of the truth and of the Spirit, the opposing principle is enforced by the moral *critique*, and moral corrective energy of the divine testimony. The process, therefore, instead of being revolutionary, is reformative and preformative, acting and operating from within outward, in a continuous and steadily advancing course of instruction, which, at the same time, is of a formative and educative nature—pedagogical in its character, not doctrinal, or scholastic. By these means they endeavored to produce repentance and faith. These are the foundations which the gates of Hell cannot overthrow. Repentance consists more particularly in self-renunciation, and the renouncing of the world. By this act men are spiritually, more and more delivered from the influences of their own selfish nature, and freed from the controlling power of all outward relations, even so by faith, as the personal surrender to the Lord, his word and work, they become more and more united to the one divine influence and truth in Christ. In this way, they are, at the same time, builded together with each other, into a spiritual and living *typus*, and on this true foundation, a oneness or union of sentiment and conduct is produced. *This is the evangelical plan of union.*

In this training up of disciple-factors who will bring forth, as actual fruits, the end aimed at, and in the proper use of the functions and means hereunto appointed; in these consists the object, the province, the charge of the reforming and preforming work, if a true Church of Christ is to be organized; otherwise a mere religious association, or an external ecclesiastical system will be manufactured.

A Christian Church can only be organized after the manner of the Spirit, *i. e.*, it must be organized internally, and by internal means, before its individual members are collected and constituted into a particular external congregation. These individuals must always be first sought out in the ever existing sphere of nature, and of the world, and then prepared and trained for the spiritual fellowship of the body of Christ.

3. *The Particular Organization of the Church.* The O. T. Church was externally founded and organized in connection with the revelation of the law; the N. T. Church, in connection with the revelation of the spirit. The band of disciples, that had been trained by Christ, and that, in

the acts of the apostles, prior to the outpouring of the Spirit, were simply called *μαθηταί*, not yet *εκκλησία*, were filled with the Holy Ghost, who seizing them individually brought a spiritual life to pass in each of them. This band of disciples endued with the power of the Spirit, constitutes the nucleus of the Church, to which an increasing number of new believers joined themselves. Acts 2 : 43 ; 47. How did this take place?

(a) Primarily a summary testimony was given of the Gospel plan of salvation, in its universality, and to those moved by this a special call to embrace it was extended in the name of the Lord. This appears in Acts 2, as the *objective* condition, and means of realizing a Christian Church.

The *subjective* condition is a voluntary surrender to the call of salvation, induced by the uncorrupted presentation of fundamental and eternal truths, and grounded upon a believing change of heart. The decisive test, was not the length of a course of instruction, nor a certain amount of acquirements, but the criterion was this: That the great truths and doctrines of salvation, found entrance into, and produced a change of heart. Acts 2 : 37. This must ever continue the norm for us. It was necessary then, and it still is, that the believing change of mind should verify itself, by some positive act, which will decisively sever the individual from his old associations, and sunder him from his former manner of life. This, in the primitive Church, was actually done through baptism, as the spontaneous, public, solemn uniting with the despised Christ and his word. When Christianity, according to its inward constitution, stood in full and decided opposition to the world, and in its outward form, was the object of universal hatred and contempt, then, and there, baptism was an act, authenticating and confirming the individual's faith. And as this matter was left to free personal choice, and that choice influenced and determined by nothing but the internal conscientious conviction of the subject, the voluntary reception of baptism constituted the actual criterion of the renunciation of self, and the world. If, in exceptional cases, deception, or hypocrisy, chanced to be practiced, the subject would, on the one hand, continually stand under the rigid surveillance of all the others, while on the other hand, amid the numerous external pressures brought to bear upon him, he could not long escape detection.

tion. In the event of one being exposed, tolerance was not thought of; reformation was required, and when this failed, he was excommunicated.

(b) *Let us observe more closely the subjects constituting the Church.* It is evident, from what has been said, that *faith* is the distinctive element of the Church—a faith, indeed, which on the one hand, is grounded upon a practical, experimental knowledge of the divine economy of grace, and a change of heart, as both are induced by the word of redemption, and which, on the other hand, through the medium of a baptismal profession enters into the fellowship, of the law of Christ and his Spirit. In this fellowship, however, there is from the start, a distinction among the members themselves: there are found those who are spiritually strengthened, who have already been baptized with the Spirit's power and light, who, in the knowledge of the truth, in the obedience and liberty of the truth, are examples to the rest. And even among these, again a gradation appears, as was the case with the apostles themselves. On the other hand, we find spiritual babes, new-born, who are still weak, having but the Spirit receptive—the elements of a spiritual life, not as yet the full, or developed light and power of the Spirit. Nevertheless, they are fraternally, (not hierarchically) united with the rest, and through them, in a process of constant advancement in the sanctification of the Spirit, and the knowledge of the truth. *Acts 2: 41; Rom. 15: 1—3; 6; Heb. 5: 12; 1 Cor. 3: 1; 1 Peter 2: 2; 2 Th. 2: 13.* Such distinctions are recognized in the Church, but not the distinction between believers and unbelievers, or converted and unconverted members.

4. From what has been said upon the genetic formation and the organization of the Church, we may now proceed to give *the true idea of a Church.* A Christian Church answers to its historic origin and character, when the union is really a voluntary one, and consists of believers, (*Acts 2: 41*; they that received the word, *4: 32*), of such believers, especially, as have, on the basis of the eternal doctrines of salvation, attained a change of heart, sundering them from the world. *Matth. 10: 37; Luke 14: 46.* Such as acknowledge and worship Jesus Christ, who is rejected by the world, as their Lord, and through this belief of the truth are sanctified; in other words, of such as have made peace with God, through the righteousness of Christ,

and continue in the sanctification of the Spirit, as their calling. Thus, the Church is truly the peculiar people of God, chosen by God from out of the world. 1 Cor. 1:2; 1 Peter 1:2. The mere proclamation of the Gospel, or the pure doctrine, and the hearing of it, though all of it be, in general, believed, does not constitute the Christian Church, or a member of it. The pure doctrine was nowhere wanting when Christ preached, and believing hearers, in a general sense, were almost everywhere found, but all this only prepared the way for the Church. It was introductory to the true Church condition. Neither does a formal confession of faith, or symbol form the constituent element of a Church. The original Church commenced and continued without one. But *faith*, affecting heart and life, must be added to the pure word of truth, in other words, a believing confession of the pure truth, proceeding from the heart, and verifying itself in *actual obedience*, constitutes the subject a member of the Church of Christ. Acts 8:37; Rom. 10:9; 1:5; 6:17; Math. 7:21—24: John 8:30; 1 John 2:3, &c.

Faith, therefore, in its specific and eternal character, involving the heart and life, is the essential, constituent element of the Church, both in the individual and in the congregation. Hence, the question, whether the unbelieving and unconverted may be embraced in the Church, whether they belong to the conception of the Church, is easily answered. We must, in the first place, distinguish the present from the original condition of the Church. If this question be brought to bear upon the modern ecclesiastical communities [in Europe,] it must not be forgotten, that these have come into being, by a process entirely different from that under which the Bible Church was founded. They gain their members, not by free conviction, and voluntary connection, but they annex them by means of external and involuntary bonds, by the power of political favor, or detriment, &c. These associations, therefore, must embrace involuntary members, and, accordingly, tolerate within their communion unbelieving and unconverted persons. This is, also, the case, when ecclesiastical fellowship is identified with a national religious culture, as for instance, where the Church is a national, or state institution. Here, too, the unbelieving and unconverted cannot be excluded, as improper elements, so long as they do not array themselves in *actual opposition* against the Church, so long as

they do not avow, or show themselves, absolutely irreligious. But the state of the case is very different, when we come to the Church of the Bible, to an actual congregation, an "*Ecclesia*," where a voluntary *faith* is the first, and constant pre-requisite, and constitutes the badge of ecclesiastical fellowship. As *faith*, in its Scriptural sense, includes *conversion*, a biblical Church must, necessarily, exclude the unconverted and unreformed. John 15: 19; 17: 8; 14, 16; Rom. 8: 9; 1 Cor. 6: 9—11, &c. The unbelieving and unconverted may, through mistake, oversight, or usurpation, intrude themselves into the Christian Church. They are in it then, *de facto*, but not *de jure*, and though there externally, yet internally, their union with the Church is impossible. The Scriptural idea does not regard them, as called, or "chosen," hence, as soon as they become manifest as unbelievers, they are, as far as possible, made the subjects of ecclesiastical discipline, and expelled from the communion.

As certainly then as conversion, in virtue of personal faith, and the spiritual union with Christ produced by it, determines the reality of Church-fellowship, (Acts 2: 39—41,) so certainly does the definition of the Church, given by the Reformers, not only convey the ideal, or philosophic conception of the Church, but that definition is essential to her historic, and only conception; it is essential to her sole reality, to her actual existence. The Church is the communion of believers and saints, standing in the knowledge and confession of the great truths of salvation, and who, by the same Gospel, and by the same Holy Spirit, are formed together into a spiritual body of Christ. (Aug. Con. Arts. VII, VIII, Apol. IV.)

The fundamental idea of the specific conception of the Church is, accordingly this: *The Church is a communion, or union, essentially and actually formed, and continued only by means of an inward reality, by means of a believing, living, spiritual union with the Lord, on the basis of his Word and Sacraments.* It is the doctrine of the symbols, as it is of the Scriptures, that the unbelieving and ungodly cannot possibly be members of the true Church.

They are merely possible adherents, external participants. Their adherence to the Church is incidental, abnormal, not as with members, an internal, essential, normal union. The presence of such persons in the true Church is an external possibility, relatively inevitable, but they stand in in-

ternal opposition to the idea of the Church, as is most clearly set forth in the "Apology": *Sunt enim membra regni diaboli, &c., &c.*

Wherever these are constituent members of a Church, however, this is itself a proof, that such a congregation, considered as a whole, is a mere outward religious association, and not the true Church. Though as members, they outwardly participate in the Word and Sacraments, they do not share in the blessings of justification and sanctification mediated through them. The assertion, that baptism constitutes the Church, is a contradiction of the VIIth Article of the Augsburg Confession. This teaches, not that the mass of those who are baptized constitute the Christian Church, but "the congregation of all believers, among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity, and the holy sacraments are administered according to the Gospel." Since the ungodly and unbelieving stand in direct internal opposition to the Church, they must needs be separated from a healthy congregation. 1 Cor. 5 : 11 ; 2 Cor. 6 : 14. Where, from want of external power, or in virtue of other circumstances, this is impossible, the distinction between believers and unbelievers must still continually be set forth—in a spiritual manner, by the testimony and doctrine of the Word—and what belongs to the former alone must, in no way, be adjudged, or conceded to the latter. When, however, in ecclesiastical communion, it has come to this, that unbelieving and unconverted men are there, not as mere outward necessary evils, but their membership is claimed and vindicated, as an internal necessity, then this must be considered as the same guilty sort of necessity, through which corruptions, and offences, in general, come into the world. The Church is thereby proved to have become secularized, and falls under the same woe which has been denounced against the world. It may then be said, Woe to the Church, as well as woe to the world. Such offences are permitted to come, not only through God's forbearance, but also, in virtue of His justice, i. e., not only according to the law of the free development of sin, but also, according to the law of the just consequences of sin. But this does not justify those evil necessities, or render them guiltless and inculpable; neither on the other hand, does an instance of condemnation and casting off, according to divine law and order, suppose forcible compulsion, or absolute reprobation. The former principle is violated

by obstinate adherents of the established Church, the latter, by over zealous antagonists of it.

The view here given, relative to the divine forbearance and divine justice, is taken from the parables in Matthew 13. The rejected tares had the power of development, by divine sufferance, but the development, they were permitted to make, was not a designed, an authorized, or a justified development. It is a perverse development, violating what had been divinely purposed, and it cannot escape final punishment. Those parables are historical descriptions of the development of Christ's kingdom, and not doctrinal statements of what God designed that development to be. And they do not describe the kingdom as it will, or should shape itself, *within* the Church of Christ, in accordance with the will and law of the Lord, but they portray the form, with which it appears under God's forbearance and grace, upon the mixed surface of the world; they set forth the manner in which, upon this promiscuous domain it operates and suffers, until the day of judgment.

Our Lord, in Matth. 13: 24—30; 38, does not say, The field is my Church, my "*Ecclesia*," but the field is the world. (See *Apology*.) This abnormal development is possible, and takes place only through the combination of human negligence and satanic activity. It is, accordingly, a sinful development; on the part of God merely tolerated, being neither designed nor justified. The "world," on the other hand, does not mean, that part of the world uninfluenced and untouched by Christianity, the heathen, or unchristian world, but the world contemplated as the field of Christ, (v. 24, "on his field," 27, "thy field,") and this the world is, so far as his Gospel seed has been scattered upon its soil. The Christian world is meant, not the Heathen, or Jewish world. It is the Church, not in its peculiar sense, as distinguished from the world, but in the broader empirical sense.

This "world," on which in various ways, the word of God has been sown, is taken in connection with the kingdom of God, not only where the children of the kingdom are found upon its soil, as the product of the divine seed upon good ground, but wherever the name, the seed, the word of Christ has acquired a certain influence, so that the children of the wicked even bear a Christian likeness, (*ταρες*, "tares," cockle-weed, spurious wheat,) as the tares have a strong resemblance to the wheat. The children of

the world even, have in the Christian world, the appearance of wheat. Their worldly life has a Christian tinge, they observe Christian customs. Theirs is an inferior, an outward, a counterfeit Christianity. This Christianized domain, this mixture of true and apparent Christians, this field of the Lord, the parable designates not *ekklesia*, the Church proper, but *kosmos*, the world. If the name of Church be applied to the whole mixed field, as is customary now, then we must be careful to distinguish such world-Church, such empirical Church, from the "*Ecclesia*" of Christ, the Church of the kingdom, distinctively and exclusively composed of the children of the kingdom, as the ground (v. 8.) bearing good fruit is distinguished from the rest of the field.

The wheat only, which was produced from the Lord's seed, is spoken of as representing the children of the kingdom, therefore, only those who are begotten of the word of God, those begotten of God, *those who are born again*, constitute the true Church of the kingdom. This is the real, true Church, which the Lord himself, by means of His word and Holy Spirit, is building into a structure, against which the gates of Hell shall not prevail, a structure, at the rearing of which Satan does not assist, nor mix in his sowing and working, as is the case with the world, [or state] Churches. Wherefore, the Church is called the Temple of God, not a field overgrown with weeds—a Temple in which, not only the name and word of Jesus Christ are preached and confessed, but in which dwells the spirit of God. It is the chosen generation, and not a mongrel generation. It is a generation so diametrically opposed to all other elements, that between it and them there is an essential distinction, as great as that between light and darkness, or between the seed of God, and the seed of Satan. How then, can the two form one body, under one head, or how can they form an organic union? Both elements, it is true, have a common soil, but this the Lord expressly declares, is the soil of the world, and not a common Church soil. There is no organic union between them, but a mere external fellowship, so far as the name and word of Christ still obtain in the world. On this ground, or domain of the world, on this mongrel field, the evil and the good, the true and the false, are to continue together, until the judgment. 1 Cor. 5: 10—13. While the Church, on the other hand, is expressly enjoined to

exclude here already from its fellowship, whatever becomes manifest as the seed of Satan.

With the last parable, that of the net, the sense is the same. Here, too, the true character of the Church is not under consideration, but the historical development of the kingdom of God within the world, so far as this kingdom extends beyond the Church. As this is the last parable, so it represents the last course the Gospel will take through the world. Matth. 24: 14. The net, *σαρῶν*, signifies external force, according to which men of every class, in the tumult and confusion of their terror, will be drawn within the precincts of Christianity, as is the case among fishes, in the drawing of a net. Immediately upon this gathering of the net, the great judgment is held; immediately upon the full draught, follows the thorough severance of the good from the wicked, and in consequence of this, the rejection of everything that is unfit, or useless, for the Church of the kingdom. The kingdom of heaven, thereupon, assumes its external aspect, as the reign of the justified, after that, by the grace and forbearance of God, the false and the evil had been suffered to intrude into the field, and into the net, but not into the body of Christ.

The Parables, like the Apocalypse, are historical descriptions. But the historical development is not the pure, just and genetic character of the Church. It must be judged of, by the original and authentic constitution of the Church. From mere historical developments, we can derive no doctrines, or principles, which conflict with the express definitions and laws of the biblical "*Ecclesia*." Every departure from the explicit and positive will, design and method of the Lord, is, and ever will be, unbelief and disobedience, though it may have ever so extensive an historical development. And, although in such a course men profess to be actuated by the purest and best motives, it must ever, in accordance with the express law and judgment of God, be regarded as disobedience and rebellion. The subjective view, or aim, does not alter the case, it becomes the subject, rather with penitence, to acknowledge his error, and seek to obtain forgiveness. And, if in the Church, as in the world, the divine sovereignty overrules many an evil for good, this must be ascribed to the grace of God, and not to any human wisdom or desert.

5. *General results from the foregoing.* a. *The voluntary*  
Vol. XX. No. 79. 56

union alone of the believing and converted disciples of the Gospel constitutes, in the proper sense, the true Christian Church, the real *Ecclesia*, or communion, unto whom accrue the spiritual immunities of the kingdom of God, namely: the forgiveness of sins, the bestowment of the Holy Ghost, and all associated gifts and blessings. The unconverted and unbelieving are excluded from the conception, and essential character of the Church. The Church excludes them, as standing in opposition to it. Should they even be in external connection with it, this does not make them members of the true Christian Church. They belong to the Christian world, unto whom the Gospel is preached, and shall continue to be preached for their acceptance, with exhortation and entreaty, with reproof and invitation, but never dare we proceed with force, nor award them the gracious spiritual treasures of the *parousia*. Matth. 28 : 19 ; Mark 16 : 15. Repentance and faith must first prepare and qualify them, before they can be incorporated with the Church of Christ, or an individual congregation be formed.

b. It cannot, however, on the other hand be claimed, that the true Christian Church has no sins, or sinning individuals within its fold. The converted and believing, it is true, are nowhere in the Bible, unless when their former condition is under review, (1 Tim. 1 : 15,) designated as sinners, *ἀμαρτωλοί*, for this term is employed only of such as are guilty of particular transgressions, or live in habitual sin. Luke 6 : 32—34; Rom. 5 : 8; 1 Tim. 1 : 9; 1 Peter 4 : 18; 1 Cor. 9—11, &c.

Nevertheless, the converted even have always some sin remaining, in virtue of their natural disposition, *ἀμαρτία*, and they still commit sin. 1 John 1 : 8—10. They are holy, only so far as they have been made holy through justification by faith in Christ, and continue in the sanctification of the Spirit. Apart from this, ungodly and unconverted people may actually be found in the Church; this, however, only *de facto*, not *de jure*, only through man's oversight, or the force of circumstances. They are not knowingly and willingly to be received and recognized as members of the Church. "They were not of us." (1 Jno. 2 : 19). To open sinners and unbelievers, we dare not consciously, or formally adjudge the privileges and rights of citizenship in the kingdom of God. They have no claim nor right in it. They can only, for the present, be

passively tolerated. They must not only be satisfied to find the Church conceding nothing to their unbelief and worldliness, but they must submit these to the teachings and discipline of the Church. Limited to this passive attitude, and as the subjects of pedagogic, or disciplinary treatment, yea, of zealous combating, we find temporarily in the Churches of the apostles, unholy individuals, who had crept in through oversight, or the force of circumstances. But they were not consciously received and recognized as members.

Where, on the other hand, unbelief and worldliness actively assert themselves, there it is the province of the Church to place the given person under discipline, and, in the event of this failing, excommunication becomes necessary, or, on the part of the offender, voluntary withdrawal. 1 Cor. 5 : 2, 11, 13 ; 2 Cor. 6 : 17 ; 2 Thess. 3 : 6.

c. The essential idea or character of the Christian congregation, with its peculiar prerogatives, can never be properly or justly extended over the totality of a church that is not founded upon a voluntary, self-determined union of individuals, and that knowingly gathers together the unconverted, unbelieving and worldly as being actually entitled to all ecclesiastical privileges, nor must it be extended to a church that cannot purify itself from those who are openly wicked. It is only the believing and converted that in such a mass constitute the true Church. Should there be but two or three united in the name of Christ, they, and not the totality of the congregation, compose the Church. The mass of them form but a world-church, as permitted by God's patience, not the Church founded and ordained of God, the body of Christ.

That such degenerate churches still preserve in them certain things divinely ordained and established, and not only those divinely permitted, does not entitle them to the claim of being the Church of God. For that which belongs to the divine *κτισις* and *επιτη* is not the outgrowth or merit of a degenerate church. It is merely the charge committed to them for the pure and faithful administration, of which they are held responsible. It is their sin and folly that they enervate and pollute this trust through their *μαράθοντες* and their *σπάτα*—a distinction maintained, likewise, in regard to the Jewish Church. That which is divinely entrusted, does not determine the worth or character either of the individual or the community, but the

self-active faithfulness, or unfaithfulness, maintained in regard to it. What is required of the faithful is, to preserve and defend the ~~scriptur~~, that which is the scriptural, the Christian and the original, and reject the opposing ~~scriptur~~ and ~~scriptur~~ and keep separate and pure from them. When, however, a separation of this kind can no longer be effected, nor the Church purified, then comes the duty of personal withdrawal. For we must obey God rather than men.

d. The entrance into the world of such ecclesiastical disorders is, indeed, foretold in the Bible as an ecclesiastico-historical development, but they are not sanctioned as proper or just. They incur the judgment of God. All the testimonies of Scripture, in regard to, and against, the abuses and corruptions which, under the perverted use and misuse of Christian and ecclesiastical titles, manifest themselves, give an historical illustration of those parables in Matt. 18, but they, at the same time, condemn such disorders with an express and earnest call upon believers to purify and separate themselves from such elements. They must be regarded as foreign and antagonistic to the Church, and entitled to no Christian recognition. 1 Tim. 6: 3—5; 2 Tim. 2: 21; 3: 5; 1 Tim. 4: 1.

## ARTICLE VII.

### THE GERMAN COLONY AND LUTHERAN CHURCH IN MAINE.\*

By REV. HENRY N. POHLMAN, D. D., Albany, N. Y.

On Monday, the 7th of October, 1860, taking advantage of my usual vacation, I left my residence in Albany, to make a visit to one of the ancient Churches of our faith, in the far East. This church had been in connection with the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of New York, for nearly half a century. But its aged pastor, by reason of the distance, and his growing infirmities, had only occasionally been present at our annual conventions. He had

\* An Address delivered before the Historical Society of the Lutheran Church, at its meeting in Washington, D. C., May 14th, 1869, and published by request of the Society.

now for some time been superannuated, and for two years his voice had been unheard in the sanctuary ; although, in his own humble dwelling, he still continued, from time to time, to minister to the spiritual wants of his beloved people.

But notwithstanding these ministrations, his flock were literally as sheep without a shepherd, and the consequences may be easily imagined. Some of the younger members, as is usual in towns situated on the coast, went down to the sea in ships, to behold God's wonders in the deep, and were lost to the Church. Many were scattered abroad in other directions, and being brought under stronger denominational influences, were gathered into other folds, so that only a feeble remnant remained.

But this remnant, "faithful among the faithless," remembering how in time past, they had taken sweet counsel together, and gone to the house of God in company, longed for the services of a minister, who could go in and out among them, to lead them into the green pastures, and by the still waters of God's ordinances, and to feed them with the bread of eternal life. These earnest longings were made known to the Ministerium, from time to time ; and at length, their persistent cry, that we should come over and help them, induced the Synod to appoint me as its representative to visit them, and by personal observation to ascertain their condition, and, if possible, to provide for their necessities.

In the fulfillment of this commission, I had left my pleasant home, and God having prospered me on my way; at the end of a three days journey, I found myself on the banks of the Muscongus, and in the humble dwelling of the aged Pastor.

Of that Pastor, and the people to whom he ministered, I would speak to you to-night ; and I trust that what I have to communicate of what I saw on that occasion ; and what I have since learned of the Lutheran Church in Maine, may serve to increase your veneration for those early pioneers of civilization and Christianity, though I despair to convey even a faint idea of the privations and sufferings of this excellent people, in their protracted struggle to found a colony, and establish the Church of their fathers, in those eastern wilds. But before I proceed with the history of the settlement of these colonists, it may be necessary to say a few words in relation to the country they had selected as their future home.

Almost midway between the mouth of the lovely Ken-

nebeck, and of that main artery of the lumber trade, the Penobscot, on what is now the line of Lincoln and Hancock counties, in the State of Maine, the ocean forms a deep and spacious Bay, appropriately named Broad. Into this Bay flows the little river Muscongus, on whose left bank stands the present town of Waldoborough. All the lands in this region, to the extent of thirty miles square, sterile in soil, though heavily wooded, were by original patent, dated March 2nd, 1630, granted by the Council of Plymouth to John Beauchamp of London, and Thomas Leverett of Boston, England. On the death of Beauchamp, Leverett succeeded to the estate. In 1719, John Leverett, who was then President of Harvard College, representing himself as sole heir of his grandfather, according to the English laws of primogeniture, came into possession of the whole patent.

But an emergency arising, Leverett associated with himself ten of his friends, and afterwards twenty others entered into the partnership, which gave the company the appellation of the Thirty Proprietors.

After the treaty of Utrecht, a difficulty arose which threatened the extinguishment of the claims of the Thirty Proprietors, in consequence of which they were induced to engage the services of Brig. Gen. Samuel Waldo, to effect an adjustment of the case. Proceeding to England, Waldo succeeded, by untiring application at court, in accomplishing the object of his mission; and, on his return, the Thirty Proprietors joined in surrendering to him, for his services, one-half of the patent.\*

It was on these lands, originally called the Muscongus, and afterwards from the circumstances I have mentioned, the Waldo patent, and but a short distance from where Broad Bay spreads its ample bosom to the waters of the Atlantic, that a few German emigrants located in 1739. They were supposed to have come over in the summer, or autumn of that year, on board of a vessel which brought letters of marque and reprisal from the king of England, against the subjects of Spain.†

To the few families which composed the original settlement large accessions were made in 1740, when forty other families from Brunswick and Saxony, tempted by the im-

\* Maine His. Soc. Collect. vol. VI, p. 321-322.

† Amer. Quar. Reg. vol. XIII, p. 162.

posing offers which the indefatigable Waldo, when in Europe had made and caused to be circulated in their language, arrived at Broad Bay. These settlers were unable to speak a word of the English language, and consequently could hold little intercourse, and gain but little aid from their English neighbors. They had been accustomed to seeing farms enclosed with fences; and were inexperienced in the clearing up of new lands. Their progress in agriculture was slow; their crops were injured by wild beasts, and the cattle that strayed from the neighboring settlements; and they suffered incredible hardships. They had been induced to leave Germany by the promise of one hundred acres of land; a supply of provisions for a given number of years; and the maintenance of a Gospel minister. They complained much of disappointment in these promises; for even when kept to the ear, they were broken to the hope. Their lots were laid out but twenty-five rods wide, and ran back into the wilderness two miles in length. This was an inconvenient shape for a farm, but they were easily reconciled to it at the time, as it brought their dwellings in close proximity. But the soil was hard, and covered with an unbroken forest, haunted by unknown beasts of prey, and strange and savage men.

There was then no fort, block house, or place of retreat in case of a hostile attack, no grist mill nearer than St. George's, or Damariscotta, to grind their scanty crops of "rochen," the only grain they raised, and which was generally prepared for cooking by merely bruising at home. Sighing for their fatherland, but unable to return, they despairingly lingered out the tedious years. But sad as was their present condition, greater evils were at hand. The war, in which England was then engaged with Spain, began now to assume an alarming aspect; and the growing apprehensions, that France was about to take sides with Spain in the contest, and the certainty that her subjects would persuade the Indians to join them, awakened fears, such as they never before experienced.

It is true, the Legislature of Massachusetts, of which Maine then formed a part, endeavored to prepare for the strife, by appropriating seventy-five pounds for the defence of Broad Bay. But this contributed but little to disperse the universal gloom, and soon their worst fears were real-

ized. France declared war on the 15th of March, 1744, and immediately commenced hostilities.\*

War, always to be deprecated, becomes still more sanguinary when carried on by ignorant mercenaries, at all times eager for plunder, and delighting in blood. And it was against such foes the infant colony had to contend. Nor was it long before they felt the full measure of their vengeance. The Eastern and Canadian Indians taking sides with the French, as they usually did, fell upon the defenceless outpost, determined to extirpate the young settlement at a single blow. And they were but too successful in their assault. In the month of May, 1746, they made their stealthy approach; and soon a heap of ashes was all that remained of the habitations of the peaceful settlers, many of whom were cruelly murdered, while the remainder were carried away captive either to Canada, or into the forest fastnesses of their ruthless foes.

This savage act put an end, for the time, to the settlement of the Germans at Broad Bay, and the whole country in the neighborhood remained a barren waste, until after the treaty of peace at Aix la Chapelle, Oct. 7th, 1748. "About this time, the tragic story of the original settlers' fate, or some other incident, turned the thoughts of other Germans in the fatherland, towards the same region, as an abiding place. Sympathies have strong attractions, and the soil that had drunk in the blood of their martyred brethren, was to them consecrated ground."† So says the historian. But I am rather inclined to think that the flattering representations of Gen. Waldo, who was persistent in his attempts to settle his patent, had far more influence over the minds of the phlegmatic Germans than the blood of their martyred brethren. And I am confirmed in this opinion by the fact, that early in 1750 Mr. Crelleus, who is described as a "German gentleman," made a voyage across the Atlantic, it is said, "on an errand of enquiry;" but in reality to make terms for the proper settlement of his fellow countrymen.

On his arrival, he presented a memorial to the General Court of Massachusetts, in which he proposed to remove a considerable number of Protestant families from his own country to this, provided sufficient inducements were offered.

\* Eaton's Annals of Warren, p. 61—62.

† Amer. Quart. Register, vol. XIII, p. 162.

ed, and a favorable prospect opened for their permanent establishment and prosperity. This encouragement was cheerfully afforded them.

In the following year (1751,) between twenty and thirty families came over with Mr. Etter their interpreter, among whom the earliest birth was that of Conrad Heyer, who at the time of my visit was still living, at the age of more than a hundred years, and of whom I shall have occasion to speak again before I conclude.

But the time of the arrival of this little colony was rather unfortunate, as they were landed on the sterile coast of Maine, in the latter part of the month of November, just as the severe winter of that climate was setting in. New England hospitality, however, provided them with both a welcome and a shelter. The General Court of Massachusetts with great unanimity passed an act, contributing to their necessities, and private charity was not remiss in its ministrations. Beds and bedding and other articles were liberally furnished to secure them from the inclemency of the weather, until the opening spring permitted them to reach their future home, and join the remnant of their brethren, who during the war, had fled with their families to the Fort at Louisburg for protection, but had now returned to their old possessions at Broad Bay, and on the banks of the Muscongus.

Thus, under more favorable auspices, was the German settlement at Waldoborough revived; and the future once more looked bright and promising.

Taking advantage of this hopeful beginning, General Waldo determined to persevere until he had secured the permanent establishment upon his patent of a large and flourishing community. To this end he sent his son to Germany, who published in the newspapers, and scattered, far and wide, a circular, offering the most flattering inducements to the simple-minded peasantry to emigrate to this modern El Dorado. A copy of this circular has lately come to light, and has been translated and published by the Maine Historical Society.\* It is truly a remarkable document; and as rich in promises, as if it had emanated from the prolific brain of some wily emigrant runner of the

\* Maine Hist. Soc. Collect. Vol. VI, pp., 329—30.

present day. After dwelling in magniloquent terms upon the desirableness of the location, the salubrity of the climate and the fertility of the soil, it provides to those who will of their own accord settle in Broad Bay, that they shall dwell together in certain divisions, consisting of one hundred and twenty families: and promises, that to every such district there shall be given to the church two hundred acres; to the first preacher settling among them, two hundred; to the school two hundred; and to each of the one hundred and twenty families one hundred acres, equal to more than one hundred and twenty German measurement. And this land, provided they dwell upon it seven years either in person, or by substitute, shall be guaranteed to them, their heirs and assigns forever; without their having to make the slightest recompense, or pay any interest for it. It provides that unmarried persons of twenty-one years and upwards, who embrace these offers, and venture to build upon their land, shall also receive one hundred acres, and be regarded as a family. Each district shall enjoy the protection of the laws; and so soon as it is organized, shall be entitled to send a deputy to the General Court. The colonists shall be obliged neither to bear arms nor carry on war, but in case war should arise, they would be protected by the government, and the free exercise of all Protestant religions will be guaranteed.

It promises, moreover, that there shall be given to the colonists on their arrival necessary support, for from four to six months, according as they arrive early or late in the season; and, furthermore, that if one or two Protestant preachers, having good testimonials, and unmarried, whose care is the salvation of souls, should resolve to trust to Providence, and the good will of Samuel Waldo, to go forth immediately with the rest, they shall receive, besides their free passage, a little supply of fifteen pounds sterling, out of the capital of the Company; and boards for the first church, which is to be built, shall also be given, and delivered to them.

It is further stated, that the first families going thither, although there should be several hundreds of them, they can all select their residences either in a sea-port, or on navigable rivers, where they can cut wood into cords for burning, or into timber for building material, and convey it to the shore, where it can always be taken of them by ships, for ready money, and carried to Boston, or other

cities; and from thence, whatever they need will be brought back in return, at a reasonable rate.

It considerably adds, in conclusion, that by these means the people will not only be able at once to support themselves, until the land is fit for cultivation, but, also, are freed from the trouble and expense of making wagons, and traveling by land, to which difficulties, it is well known Pennsylvania is subjected.

This imposing document is dated March 23rd, 1758, and published by authority of the Royal British Captain Waldo, hereditary Lord of Broad Bay, Massachusetts, and was soon followed by its desired results; for no less than sixty families immediately accepted its munificent offers; and we are told by the Hon. Wm. D. Williamson, the historian of Maine, that afterwards, as many as fifteen hundred Germans, encouraged by its representations, emigrated from time to time, and settled on the Patent of this self-styled hereditary Lord.

How his promises were fulfilled, is matter of history, and will be seen as we follow these sixty families to their destination. They arrived there in the month of September, and were put into a large shed, which had been erected near the shore. This shed was sixty feet long, without chimneys, and utterly unfit for human habitation; yet, here these destitute exiles, neglected by their patron, whose promises, in this instance, were wholly unfulfilled, dragged out a winter of almost inconceivable suffering. Many froze to death, many perished with hunger, or diseases, induced by their privations. The old settlers were too poorly supplied themselves, to afford much assistance to the new comers, who were fain to work for a quart of buttermilk a day; and considered it quite a boon, when they could gain a quart of meal for twelve or sixteen hours' work. They sought for employment, also, at Damariscotta and St. George's, and many of the children were put to service in those settlements. Some of them were not destitute of money, for it is a tradition, that of the three school masters, who emigrated with them, one was so wealthy and, in consequence, so arbitrary, that on any dispute arising, when arguments failed, he used to threaten to knock down his opponent with a bag of Johannes. But such was the scarcity of provisions, that even those, who had money, were unable to procure them. They were unacquainted, also, with hunting and fishing, for this, in their

own native land, had been the privilege of their Lords, and, therefore, they were unable to avail themselves of this source of supply.

Thus, in privation and suffering they passed the dreary winter months; and it was not until the following spring, that Waldo appointed an agent, Charles Leistner, to allot to them the promised lands, and deal out the provisions, which should have been distributed on their first arrival. Leistner was a man of education, exercised the powers of a magistrate, and should have protected them from imposition, but he did not entirely escape the murmurs of the settlers, who, in their privations and jealousy, accused him, perhaps without any foundation, of selling, for his own benefit, the provisions which had been furnished for them; and, in the allotment of their farms, he certainly treated them with great injustice. Instead of the hundred acres of land promised them on the sea coast, where wood would bring four shillings a cord, this agent took them back two miles into the heart of the wilderness, and there, perhaps, from fear of Indian hostilities, assigned them only a half an acre each, in a compact cluster. Here they were constrained to build their huts, carrying up boards, and covering their roofs with bark, in the best manner they were able.

But these evils were light, compared with the baptism of blood which awaited them, and which they were soon afterwards called upon to endure. For, scarcely had a year elapsed, when, in addition to their other discomforts, a band of Indians, instigated by the Romish French, fell up on the defenceless colonists, and the tomahawk and scalping knife did their bloody work. Many were barbarously slain, and others carried away captive. Little record remains of their individual sufferings, but any one, acquainted with the history of the period, knows how cruel were even the tender mercies of the Indians, and may easily imagine the untold horrors of their fate.

Such outrages led to the second French war, which was declared in June, 1756, during which, for seven long years, great hardships were endured by the colonists, and much distress occasioned by the want of provisions. Those who were able to do military duty, for the most part, enlisted under Jacob Leistner, who had been appointed Captain of a scouting party, and had charge of the stockade, or block house, which had been erected for the defence of the set-

tlement. These were the favored ones, for they drew regular pay and rations, which formed the principle support for their families. But the great majority were left in extreme destitution. The *Annalist* tells us of one family, "who subsisted a whole winter on frost fish, with only four quarts of meal; and many a German woman was glad to do a hard day's work at planting or hoeing, for eight pence, or a quart of buttermilk."

And now, (February 10th, 1763,) ~~and now to think~~

"Grim visag'd war had smoothed his wrinkled front," ~~forth~~  
and "piping times of peace" returned, but not to the harassed colonists at Waldoborough. For scarcely had the din of battle died away, before this quiet and excellent people were perplexed with troubles from another, and entirely unexpected quarter. A flaw in the title to their lands had been discovered by some mousing speculator, and one of the evils, which so often befalls the unsuspecting emigrant, was now upon them, with all its distracting anxieties.

From the report of a Committee, to whom the matter had been referred, and which was adopted by the Legislature of Massachusetts, February 28th, 1762, it appeared that Gen. Waldo (to say the least, and to put the most charitable construction upon his conduct,) labored under an erroneous impression, as to the extent of his Patent. Its true boundaries were the Penobscot on the East, and the Muscongus on the West; and, consequently, all the inhabitants on the western bank of the latter river (and these constituted the greater part of the colonists,) were without any title to their lands. True, they had deeds from General Waldo; but of what avail were these, when the General's right of ownership was invalidated. And now, what their enemies, the Indians, had spared, was liable to be taken from them by their so-called friends. They were about to loose, not only their farms, buildings and improvements, and be turned out of doors; but their Church property was in danger, for this, also, was on the litigated territory, as well as the humble temple in which they worshipped God, in the language, and after the time-honored custom of their fathers. In this dilemma, the troubled settlers, to the number of sixty or seventy families, purchased their lands anew, in 1763—64, and received other, and as they supposed satisfactory deeds from Mr. Thomas

Drowne, in behalf of the Pennaquid Company, which had established its title to them, under the patent granted by the Plymouth Council, to two merchants of Bristol, Robert Aldsworth and Gyles Elbridge, dated February 20th, 1681.

To the honor of this Company, it ought to be stated, that the settlers "were allowed to retain the lots assigned them by Waldo for public uses; and deeds were given them of one hundred acres for a meeting house; one hundred acres for the ministry; and one lot of twenty-five acres, and another of forty-one, for the support of schools."

But even this purchase did not avail to secure them quiet possession of their property. For, soon afterwards, "a possessary right," called "the Brown claim," was raised to the same lands, in virtue of ancient settlement and occupancy; and numerous depositions were taken to establish this title, to the no small alarm and perplexity of this honest and persecuted people.

Nor were the settlers on the other, or Eastern bank of the river, without serious trials and embarrassments. They had made improvements on certain portions of land within the acknowledged Waldo patent, but, either through ignorance or inadvertency, had obtained no deeds from the General before his sudden death from apoplexy near Fort Pownal, in 1759, and were, therefore, seriously molested by his heirs, who claimed under him, among whom was General Knox, who afterwards became so famous during our Revolutionary struggle. Thus were these honest, unsuspecting Germans harrassed by the harpies of the law, contrary to every principle of justice and good faith, and left, with no remedy for their grievances, and without the least remuneration or indemnity for their losses.

Justly indignant at such persistent ill-treatment and injury, disappointed in their expectations, displeased with the climate, and determined to be rid of interminable law-suits, it is no wonder that a large number of families resolved to abandon the settlement and to seek for a more desirable residence. Accordingly many of the settlers sold their estates for what they would bring, (which, in many instances, was but a miserable pittance,) and, in 1778, removed from Maine to join their German brethren, who three years before, under the advice and guidance of the Rev. Mr. Cilly, a Moravian clergyman, had emigrated to Carolina, and effected a settlement in that more genial

clime. By this emigration, according to two authorities,\* the colony lost not less than three hundred families, including many of its most skilful husbandmen, and estimable citizens. It is hardly credible, however, that so many could have been spared, at so early a period, without depopulating the place. But, whether this account be exaggerated or not, the loss was soon made up. For the Germans, like the rest of the Teutons, are a clannish race, and upon "a second serious, sober thought," many of them concluded that it was far better to retrace their steps and "bear the ills they had," than to remain among comparative strangers, and "suffer others that they knew not of," especially as the rumblings of the storm, which was soon to burst upon the Colonies, were now beginning to be heard. The great majority of them, therefore, returned, though the expense incurred, and the loss of time, had greatly increased their indigence. But they were received with joyful hearts, and many a helping hand was extended towards them, as they quietly settled down again amongst their former friends and neighbors.

During the struggle which led to the separation of the Colonies from the mother country, which shortly followed, they bore their part manfully, and endured, in common with the rest of the colonists, their full share of the privations and sufferings incident to a state of warfare, though they were not, as on former occasions, subject to the incursions of the Indians. And when peace dawned upon the land, they cheerfully returned to their usual avocations, and busily occupied themselves in the tilling of the soil. For they were essentially a farming community, and but few had as yet turned their attention to any, save the most common of the mechanic arts.

Hitherto, the settlement had consisted principally of Germans, and of the children who were born unto them. But after the close of the war of the Revolution, the facilities for ship building, afforded by the Muscongus river, and its vicinity to the waters of the Broad Cove and Bay, began to attract the attention of the descendants of the Puritans, a proverbially active and enterprising race, and soon a village sprang into existence, at the head of navigation on the eastern bank, and the population became materially changed. But the Germans still adhered to

\* Holmes' Amer. An. Williamson His. Ma.

their own language, and to the customs of their fathers, and particularly to their ancient faith. They were originally from different parts of Germany, and consisted for the most part of those who adopted the Augsburg Confession for their creed; but among them were many of the followers of Zwinglius, and some few of the Moravians, or United Brethren. But they were all of one mind, as to the necessity of establishing public worship, and paying a due regard to the institutions of Christianity; and, therefore, no sooner had they erected their huts, than they endeavored to provide a fit habitation for the mighty God of Jacob. This humble temple was built of logs, occupied a central position near the Cove, and was furnished with all the conveniences their scanty resources could supply. Here, though destitute of a regular clergyman, they constantly assembled from Sabbath to Sabbath, for public worship. At these meetings, John Ulmer, one of the principle men among them, took the lead, and acted as their minister, and as such was paid by Waldo, until the settlement was broken up by the incursion of the Indians in 1746. Upon the revival of the colony three years later, he continued to labor in the same vocation, and after the death of Leistner, he appears to have acted in the triple capacity of priest, prince and military commander. Of the distinction thus conferred upon him he was not a little vain; nor was he slow in asserting his claims, and in exacting on all occasions due honor and respect. For, we are told, that visiting the neighboring settlement of Pennaquid, towards the close of the second French war, and hailing the people in the dusk of the evening to set him across the river, in answer to the inquiry who he was, he gave his name with such a string of titles, that they expected to find a large number of persons; and were much disappointed when they found all these honors borne by a single individual.\*

This state of things continued until 1762, when the Rev. John Martin Schaeffer, who is described, I know not on what authority, as belonging to the German Lutheran Church, came from New York to Boston, and was invited by some of the inhabitants of Broad Bay to become their pastor; and John Ulmer's occupation, as the ministerial office, was gone. But from all accounts the mild government and harmless vanity of the one was but ill exchanged

\* Eaton's *Annals of Warren*, p. 115.

for the bold exactions and mean selfishness of the other; for according to the concurrent testimony of the period, Schaeffer's "character was not so adorned with graces, as to entitle his portrait to a place among the apostles of rectitude and reform."\*

Shortly after his arrival, he organized a church in two branches, Lutheran and German Reformed. This church consisted of sixty or seventy communicant members, each of whom contributed to his support, in addition to the use of the glebe, three pounds old tenor, a bushel of corn, and two days work annually. He also, received, according to the custom of those primitive times, (a custom not altogether extinct in some of our German congregations, even to the present day,) half a dollar for the baptism of each child; a like sum for each person confirmed; and a dollar for attending every funeral. But not satisfied with his income as a minister, he practised as a physician also, and gained much fame, as well as wealth, by letting blood, applying blisters, and physicing the public generally. He was applied to, by numbers from the neighboring towns, and was considered by the common people everywhere, as having no equal. He made his people believe it was necessary to be bled every spring, for which he received a regular fee of fifty cents for each inhabitant. These emoluments, with such advantages as his property, influence and education, enabled him to take, in making bargains, soon rendered him opulent. And as the love of lucre grows by what it feeds on, he was no longer content with the profits derived from preaching and the practice of medicine; but engaged in navigation, receiving the lumber and wood of the illiterate Germans, on commission, to sell in Boston, and always taking out his own demands from the proceeds, and liquidating the amounts in his own way. Many a poor man had to work a week for him, to pay for the annual loss of blood in himself and family; and when any considerable sickness occurred, a sloop's hold, full of wood went to pay the doctor's bill. As his wealth increased, all restraint was thrown off, and his vices appeared without a blush. He was very profane, grew intemperate, and though an eloquent preacher, gradually lost all influence as a minister. But this gave him little, or no concern;

\* Amer. Quart. Register, vol. XIII, p. 164.

for when remonstrated with, by his people, for his improper behaviour, he was accustomed to excuse himself by saying: "When I have my black coat on, den I am a minister, and you must do as I *say*, but when I have my green coat on, den I am a toctor, and I can do as I please."<sup>\*</sup>

Thus, did this wolf in sheep's clothing continue to fleece, with impunity, his defenceless flock. "But the triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the hypocrite but for a moment." And it may be mentioned, as a striking instance of retributive justice, that while residing in the neighboring town of Warren, to which he removed in after years, and where he continued his medical practice, and in addition, took out a license to retail spirituous liquors, for which he himself was the best customer. His house, during his temporary absence in Boston, was entered in the dead of night, by four men in disguise, who seized the women, the only inmates, pinioned their arms, confined them in the cellar, broke open the chests and closets, containing his hoards of silver and gold, and stripped him of all his ill-gotten gains. Every attempt to discover the burglars, or to recover the stolen treasure, was unavailing; and the miserable wretch, in rage and despair, plunging still deeper into intemperance, died as the fool dieth, and "made no sign."<sup>†</sup>

It is said this miserable man was pastor of the church for nearly twenty years; but it is hardly credible, that the great body of the congregation, should have endured his ministrations so long, and it is more than probable, that the number of his adherents was but few. Indeed, it is matter of record, that in 1767, the Rev. Mr Cilly, a pious Moravian clergyman, came from Germany to Broad Bay, who, being a more spiritual-minded man, and exemplifying in his life and conduct the reality of the doctrine he preached, drew away and converted to the Moravian faith many of the settlers, who, in 1770, removed with him to Carolina, and joined a similar society there.<sup>‡</sup> And we have positive testimony, that the church was without a pastor in 1774.

Among the old documents at Hartwick Seminary, there is a call, dated May 28th, 1774, addressed to the Rev.

\* Eaton's Annals of Warren, p. 116—17.

† April 20th, 1794.

‡ Eaton's Annals of Warren, p. 134.

John Christopher Hartwick, *pro tem.* pastor of the church at Boston, and superintendent of sundry Evangelical congregations, scattered up and down in America ; which describes the church at Waldoborough, as being "like sheep without a shepherd, destitute of the ministry of the Gospel, and scattered, and fainting for want of spiritual pasture, to the great detriment of its spiritual state." It moreover informed him, that he had been unanimously elected pastor, and earnestly entreated him to become their spiritual guide. Nay, so anxious were the people to secure the services of a pastor, that they furthermore empowered Hartwick, in the event of his being unable to accept their call, to select any person whom he should deem suitable for the position, and unanimously agreed to abide by his decision. In compliance with this call, it is known that Hartwick visited Waldoborough, and performed ministerial duties there in July 1774, but whether he remained with them for any length of time, is extremely doubtful, as he was proverbially fond of change. At any rate, there is no further record of his ministry.

The next we hear of the congregation, is in 1785, when a Mr. Croner appears to have been its pastor. But during his ministry, which continued four years, no progress was made in the life of godliness, and nothing accomplished for the Redeemer's kingdom ; for, according to the record, "he was an evil example to his flock, a reproach to the ministry, and an injury to souls."\* Whether this Croner was ever regularly inducted into the ministry, is extremely problematical ; and from all accounts he appears to have been one of that class of imposters, with which our Church has been so much cursed in the past, and from which every lover of our Zion ought earnestly to pray, that she may be delivered in the future.

But Providence had better things in store for this long suffering, and oft deceived people. Taught by bitter experience, not to trust in every adventurer, who represented himself to be a Lutheran minister, they sought advice from the Synod of Pennsylvania, and thereby obtained the services of a pastor, who more than compensated them for all the disappointments of the past. For the Rev. Augustus Ferdinand Rity, who, upon the recommendation of that Synod, was called in 1795, was not only a man of piety

---

\* Amer. Quart. Register, vol. XIII, p. 164.

and learning, but, unlike his predecessors, had the interest of the Redeemer's kingdom much at heart, and was deeply imbued with the love of souls. He was a native of Germany, and educated at the University of Helmstadt; had been in this country about a year, during which, he was pastor of four small congregations, within the bounds of the Pennsylvania Synod, of which he was a member; and now undertook to serve the church at Waldoborough, for the annual salary of two hundred and twenty dollars, and the use of a hundred acres of land. Like his predecessors, he preached in the German language exclusively, and when first called upon by the neighboring clergy, being unacquainted with the English, was able to converse with them only in Latin; though afterwards, as he became better acquainted with this country, and its institutions, he was one of the few German ministers, who had the good sense to advise his parishioners to abandon their German schools, and give their children an English education; and had his sensible advice been followed, we should not have been obliged to record, to night, the decline and final extinction of the Lutheran Church in Maine. It is said, by his contemporaries, that Mr. Rity was remarkably sedate in his deportment, and rarely indulged in anything that would excite a smile; and that the nearest approach to levity he ever exhibited, was in the case of Mr. Demuth, one of his parishioners. This man had in some way taken offence at his pastor, (a common occurrence in ministerial experience,) and refused to speak to him. Mr. Rity, in company with a friend, passing him one day, in the usual manner, without receiving a nod, the friend observed: "There goes Mr. Demuth." "Nein, Nein," said the minister, nicht Meister Demuth, Meister Hochmuth."\* But this was an exception, for otherwise he was

"Affectionate in look

And tender in address, as well became

A messenger of grace to guilty men—"

"Much impress'd

Himself, as conscious of his awful charge,

And mainly anxious that the flock he fed

Should feel it too."

And much did he need these gifts and graces, for he had

\*Eaton's *Annals of Warren*, p. 271.

hard work to perform, many thorns and briars to remove, and a field to cultivate, which had long lain waste, and brought forth no fruit unto righteousness. But he was fully qualified for the task, and he labored not alone, for God was with him, and gave him many souls for his hire, and as his crown of rejoicing. He was only too soon removed from the toils of his spiritual husbandry on earth, to reap the glorious rewards of the heavenly harvest home. For he suddenly expired, after a sixteen years' ministry, in 1811; and devout men, with saddened hearts, carried him to his burial, universally lamented by all who knew him, both Americans and Germans, leaving behind a reputation, as his biographer quaintly remarks: "Like an array of gems which never fade."

And, now, the widowed church was again without a pastor, but she did not sit long overwhelmed with grief, bemoaning her desolate condition; for God heard her cry, and sent her in the autumn of 1812, and in the person of the Rev. John William Starman, a teacher to go before her, as a pillar of cloud and of fire, to direct her by day and by night. The aged German Christians of Waldoborough, hailed his coming with delight, and wept for joy, that once more before their death, they could sit and listen in their own language, to the words of heavenly wisdom, to edify their minds, and kindle into new life their religious zeal. I said, the *aged German Christians*; for, alas, the younger members of their families, for want of English preaching, had generally joined the Congregational church, which had been gathered by the new comers in 1807, under the ministry of the Rev. John R. Cutting. But the old settlers, and some few of their immediate descendants, were a staid generation, not excitable, or effected by what they denominated new-light doctrine and preaching, and imagined that they could not understand the preaching of the Gospel in any other than the German language. Hence, they insisted on the suicidal policy, to have all the services of the church exclusively in German, making no provision for the firstlings of the flock, who, by association with their English-speaking neighbors, had gradually lost the knowledge of their mother tongue; and who, by this policy, were constrained, if they desired spiritual food, to leave the ancient fold, and feed in other pastures. Under these circumstances, it was impossible to infuse a younger and more vigorous element into the slumbering and dying

energies of the Church ; and Mr. Starman was destined to labor comparatively in vain, and to spend his strength for naught.

But one thing he was enabled to do. From the first organization of the church, the Lutherans and German Reformed, who composed it, were accustomed to have the Lord's Supper administered to them separately. Though this did not accord with his views of Christian communion, he nevertheless continued the custom, for the sake of peace and harmony ; always, however, giving a pressing invitation to the different parties to discard their prejudices, and lovingly to unite in partaking of the sacred feast. At first, few complied with the invitation, but the number gradually increased, until on the 17th of June, 1829, the separating wall was entirely taken away. At a meeting of the church members, held at that period, it was unanimously resolved, that the different parties would hereafter commune together, according to a prescribed form ; and from that time forward, both classes approached the Lord's table together, as one undivided family, in the unity of the Spirit, and in the bonds of peace.

A citizen of Waldoborough describes one of these joyful occasions, which must have been peculiarly interesting and impressive. He speaks of the "tottering monuments of the early days, of the first settlers of Broad Bay," surrounding the sacramental board—of Conrad Heyer, who for more than seventy years, occupied a conspicuous seat in the singing gallery, both in the old log meeting house, at the Cove, and then at the church now dilapidated and in ruins, about three quarters of a mile from the village,\*—but he says nothing of those, who in the bud and blossom of their years, had consecrated themselves to the service of the Master—for alas, they were not there with their parents, to eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. And how can a church flourish, when the natural sources of its increase and vitality are cut off ? For though the pastor had now, for some time, been permitted to preach occasionally in English, yet from his imperfect knowledge of the language, the want of fluency in the delivery of his sermons, or some other cause, he failed to attract the young, though they universally respected him, or to bring any of the wanderers back again into the ancient fold.

---

\* Maine His. Soc. Collec., vol. V. p. 409.

The Rev. Mr. Starman, was a man of faith, and a man of prayer, but he could not work miracles; and little short of a miracle could save the decaying church at Waldo-borough, from the dissolution which awaited it.

My first acquaintance with this man of God, was at the Synod of our Ministerium, in August, 1823. He was then upwards of fifty years of age, unmarried, and so bashful and diffident, that he avoided rather than sought the society of the gentler sex; and probably he would have gone through life, wanting that blessing of the Lord, a *good wife*, but for the intervention of his congregation; who, believing that it was not good for him to be alone, and that his efficiency as a pastor would be increased, by his having a *helpmeet* from among the daughters of the land, took the matter into their own hands so completely, as not only to designate who should be his bride, but also, to negotiate with her family and herself, as to the terms and conditions of the marriage.\* And though "matrimony is a matter of more worth than to be dealt in by attorneyship," he cheerfully acquiesced in the arrangement, and in due time, the parties, to their mutual satisfaction, were firmly united in the silken tie.

This, no doubt, contributed greatly to his usefulness at the time, and, as I can testify from personal observation, was a source of comfort and happiness to him, in his declining years. And much did he need careful nursing and kind attention in his old age. For I found him a perfect wreck of his former self, afflicted with erysipelas, almost blind, and nearly helpless; yet, the same simple-hearted, prayerful, God-fearing, and God-loving man as ever. Never shall I forget the gleam of joy, which illumined his aged countenance, as I alighted from the stage coach, and entered his humble dwelling. His troubles now seemed to be over, the desire of his heart to be gratified. His people were once more to be gathered in the old church, and to hear the Gospel from the lips of a Lutheran minister. Immediate arrangements were made for religious services, on every day of the limited period of my visit. On Friday evening I preached in a neighboring school house; and such an audience of aged men and women, my eyes had never before beheld. At the close of the services, which were listened to with rapt attention, they clas-

\* Maine His. Soc. Collec., vol. V. p. 409.

tered round me, and had I been the President of the United States, I could not have received a more hearty greeting, while they hailed with joy the proposition I made, in behalf of the Ministerium, that we would send them a minister, provided they would aid in his support, by the contribution of one hundred and fifty dollars annually. On the following afternoon I addressed the congregation again, at the house of Conrad Heyer, the first born among the settlers at Broad Bay, who, although one hundred and one years old, was as brisk and active as a man of fifty; and who, according to his wont, for more than eighty years, acted as chorister, and led us in a hymn of praise, reading without spectacles the small print of Watts' duodecimo Hymn Book, and singing even the highest notes, with scarcely any of the tremulousness of age. But Sunday was the great day of the feast; for all the settlers far and near, to the third and fourth generations, crowded to the dilapidated church, on foot, and in all kinds of ancient vehicles. The aged pastor was there wrapped in flannels, having been carefully conveyed thither by one of his attentive deacons—the little remnant of his flock was there, ancient men and women not a few, having for the most part passed three score years and ten, fondly recalling the days of their youth, when they kept holy day together, and had gone to the house of God in company. After two services in the old church, and a third, in the Baptist meeting house in the village, the congregation was dismissed to meet on Monday afternoon, to listen to another sermon, and learn the result of the effort which was being made to comply with my proposition, and secure the services of a minister. At that meeting it was announced, that the committee appointed for that purpose, after the most strenuous efforts, had been able to secure only between fifty and sixty dollars; and the amount of a collection taken on the spot, for my expenses, which they insisted on defraying, was only one dollar and thirty-one cents. It was not, that they did not desire the services of a Gospel minister. It was not because they were penurious; for I doubt not, that each one subscribed to the full extent of his ability. But it was because, for the most part, they were almost entirely destitute of the means of comfortable living, and had absolutely nothing to spare from their scanty earnings.

Under these circumstances, as the feeble few were una-

ble to supply even the necessary clothing for a pastor, and as there was no material in the settlement which might be counted on for the resuscitation and growth of the congregation, they came to the unanimous conclusion to disband their organization, and seek a spiritual home in the neighboring Congregational Church, where since the disability of their pastor they had been fed, and in whose communion many of their children were already numbered. Though with great reluctance, I could not but acquiesce in their decision; and commanding them to God and to the word of his grace, the parting prayer was offered, the farewell hymn sung, and we separated, to meet no more, until assembled.

"Where congregations ne'er break up  
And Sabbaths ne'er shall end!"

Nearly twenty years have elapsed since that memorable visit, and time has wrought its usual changes. That aged pastor, who died in 1854, in his eighty-second year, and that ancient band of pilgrims, who clung to him to the last, have all gone to join the general assembly and church of the first born, whose names are written in heaven. The afflicted minister's agonizing prayers for his people are turned into joyful songs of praise for their deliverance from these earthly tabernacles, and their exaltation to the city which hath foundations, and the house not made with hands—Old Conrad Heyer, clothed in immortal youth, is singing the song of Moses and the Lamb—and nothing remains on earth to mark the place of their sojourn, and the Church of our fathers in the State of Maine, but the dilapidated ruins of the house, in which they once worshipped God—and the tall marble column in the neighboring graveyard, erected by the noble liberality of the citizens of Waldoborough, which tells the passing traveller, that *Here lie the remains of the sainted Rity and Starman, the once able and efficient pastores of the German Lutheran Church of Broad Bay!*

Gentlemen and Brethren of the Historical Society! This painful history, will not have been presented to you in vain, if we will only learn the important lessons which it teaches: How utterly futile is the attempt to build up a little Germany in America.

How surely an isolated church, using exclusively the German language, surrounded by an English speaking population, and receiving no accessions from the Fatherland, must die out in the course of three or four generations. And above all

How absolute is the necessity of a perfect union and communion of the German and English element, in our ecclesiastical councils, if we would attain to that position in this land, which of right to us belongs as the first pure Protestant Church of the Reformation. For this union I have always contended. This has been one of the objects of my life and labors. This should be the burden of our prayers, before the throne of heavenly grace. And though late developments in our beloved Zion, may seem to have deferred this desirable event, it will come. It *must* come, or the Lutheran Church in the United States will be numbered, like the Church in the State of Maine, among "the things that were."

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### THE SPECIAL MISSION OF THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY; ITS PRINCIPLES AND ITS INTELLECTUAL RESOURCES.\*

By Rev. J. H. W. STÜCKENBERG, A. M., Pittsburgh, Pa.

It is not necessary, on this occasion, to discuss the power of the press, "the theme of so many declamations and commonplaces, but to whose merits and effect, no com-

---

\* After the delivery of the Address at the Anniversary of the Publication Society, at the late meeting of the General Synod, in Washington, a resolution was adopted, requesting a copy of the Address, for publication in the *Evangelical Review*. The author is unable to comply strictly with this resolution, because, at the time of its delivery, only a part of the Address was written. As here published, some things may be added, which were not originally in the Address, while others may be omitted. The substance, however, is the same.

monplaces, or declamations, will ever be able to do justice." Nor is it necessary to prove the necessity of the Publication Society, since this is acknowledged by all. The organization that wants to live and grow, must publish and defend its views. No one doubts, that this Society has a general aim and mission, namely : to publish and circulate religious books. But some are not fully conscious of the fact, that, as a Church, we have a special mission, which is, also, the mission of our Publication Society. That the mission of this Society is in harmony with the principles of the General Synod, is evident from the second article of the Constitution: "This Society, assuming the doctrinal basis of the General Synod, shall have for its object, the diffusion of religious knowledge, by means of translations and religious productions, and thus to furnish, and circulate a suitable literature for our Church."

Physical and intellectual power is, in itself, neither good nor bad ; it is the motive that lies back of the power, and controls it, which determines its moral character. It is the choice of an aim for life, either in harmony with God's aim, or contrary thereto, that consecrates, or curses a man's faculties. Every Society, if there is any reason for its existence, and if it is really a unity, whatever may be its variety, has, like the individual, a conscience, a law, a motive, a sphere of operation, and a mission ; and these determine its character. And as every person has a peculiar mission, for which he is specially adapted, and to which he, and he only is called, and which no one else can perform ; so every Society should have a special reason for its existence, and a peculiar mission. If any two Societies have exactly the same mission, then they should cease to be two, by being united into one Society, so that by their union, their power to accomplish the mission might be increased. The Lutheran Publication Society has a peculiar mission ; and it was organized, because it was felt, that there is for it a work, which can be done by no other existing organization. It is its mission, that makes it either important, or insignificant ; and in order that the worth of the Society may be known, we must have a clear idea of its mission.

The great German theologian Schleiermacher said, that he did not so much regard it as his business to teach people something new, as to make them realize that which was already in them. And whilst discussing this mission, it

shall not be my aim to say anything new, but to make you conscious of that which is already in you.

The Lutheran Publication Society is the preacher of the General Synod. Through it, the Synod declares its principles to the Church, and to the world. It aids the minister, by instructing him, and by assisting him to enlighten his people. But mere general enlightenment cannot be the great aim of the Society, for then it would have no special mission, since this is more or less the aim of every Publication Society. Nor can its special aim be to spread religious literature of a general character among our people, for, that could be done as well, and perhaps, more cheaply, by other Societies. But its special aim is, to do what no other Society can, to make our principles familiar to all, and to provide a literature that naturally springs from these principles, and harmonizes with them.

The character, the worth, and the inherent power of a Society, are not dependent on the area of territory occupied, nor on the number of persons embraced in the Society, nor on the amount of money it commands; but on the principles underlying the Society, and a faithful adherence to them. Not where it is, not how great a show it makes, not the number of its advocates, but *what* it is, determines the character of the Publication Society. The principles of an organization are its essence; and in proportion as these are living and life-giving, will the organization be vigorous, or weak.

If, as a Church, we have a special work to perform, then this Society, also, has a special mission, for it is the out-growth and the exponent of the Church. And that our Church has a special mission, only the superficial observer will undertake to deny. Whilst we have much in common with other Evangelical Churches, we nevertheless occupy a position, that makes us distinct and peculiar. In government, in ceremonies, and even in doctrine, we are, in many respects, similar to other Churches; but, that which distinguishes us from them, is a great fundamental principle, which lies back of all form, and ceremony, and government, and doctrine. With Luther, we adhere strictly to the word of God, as the supreme authority; but with him we also insist, that this supremacy of Scripture must not be destroyed practically, by making its interpretation depend on human authority. With Luther, too, we aim, not to establish, or perpetuate a sect, or mere denomina-

nation, but to restore and perpetuate the Church itself, the Church established by Jesus and his Apostles. Therefore, we claim, that the basis of the Church, the Christian Church, is broad enough, and narrow enough for us, without enlarging it, as is done by some systems of infidelity, without contracting it, as is done by sectarianism. We want the conditions of fellowship to be the same as those made by Christ and his Apostles; and we cannot believe, that to be the true Church, which makes conditions of fellowship, which exclude any person whom Christ receives as a disciple. In this respect we stand with the Church of the Reformation, before bitter contention rent it into factions, and sectarianized the Evangelical Church. Luther aimed to reform the Church, and, therefore, he tried to restore the basis of the Church itself, on which all must stand, who are Christians. He did not aim to establish a mere sect, which would require a basis narrower than that of the Church, and would necessarily exclude some who belonged to the Church of Christ. As children and heirs of the Reformation, we claim all the rights and privileges claimed by the Church of the Reformation, whether they be positive or negative, constructive or destructive—the aim always being to build up the Church of Christ. If truths have been hid, they must be brought to light again; if their growth has been checked, it must again be promoted; if errors have been promulgated, they must be exposed and rejected; if abuses are practiced, though association and antiquity may have made them dear, they must be reformed. This work was not finished by the Reformers, but it was commenced by them; they did not do our work, but they prepared the way for it, and teach us how to do it, just as they do not interpret the Bible for the Christian, but give him the Gospel, and teach him how to interpret it for himself. A Church, which has only the doctrinal results of the Reformation, which it treasures as an unchangeable possession, may be called a Reformed Church; but a Church, which has, also, the spirit and the principles of the Reformation, must necessarily be a reformatory Church. To be still more explicit, we must say, that the Reformation did not produce a Church perfectly reformed, but it produced a reformatory Church, which was to continue unceasingly the work of reformation already begun. And Churches now prove glaringly, their departure from the principles of the Reformation, by

clinging only to doctrines that have been handed down from age to age, while they totally ignore, or explicitly reject the reformatory spirit and principles, which made the Reformation what it was. If the Reformation finished what it commenced, so that its life became petrified into a dead system, that can be transmitted from age to age, then we are not the children and heirs of the Reformation, and do not desire to be. But if it commenced a work of ceaseless progress, then we claim to be of the Reformation; and we legitimate our claim by the fact, that we are a reformatory Church, with the principles that were the law of the great Reformation, and with the spirit and life that were its inspiration.

It is, indeed, true, that the highest Christian consciousness of the age is with us. The most spiritual and the most clear-sighted Christians of all Churches acknowledge our fundamental principle, that there are certain essential doctrines, on which unity is demanded by Christ and his Apostles, that on other non-essential doctrines, liberty must be granted, a liberty that is essential to the Church, to keep it from sectarianism; and that the Church has no more right to make a basis for fellowship, narrower than Christ made, than it has a right to make a basis broader, than that made by him. "Other foundations can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ;" and this foundation is as essentially destroyed by contraction as by expansion. And the most advanced of the various Christian Churchs practice this principle, laid down in our basis, whatever their creeds may say. The Presbyterian Church no more binds to non-essentials in its creed, than does the Lutheran Church; if it did, the Church would be still more shattered than it is, and it would be as inefficient in life, as extreme Calvinism is in the pulpit. The same is true of the Episcopal and other Churches. But, I believe, that ours is the first Church in this country, which declared agreement in fundamentals, and liberty in non-fundamentals, to be, not merely a practical rule, but a principle—a principle that is essential to the Church, to distinguish it from sectarianism. We thus have a basis, which none can stand on but a Christian, and on which every Christian must stand. With this principle, the problem for us to solve is, how the most perfect unity can be secured in the greatest diversity, consistent with Christianity;

and how with true Gospel liberty, we can form the most compact organization.

Those who understand our position, need not be told, that our liberty is not licentiousness, and that our principles do not lead to confused eclecticism, or religious chaos, but to systematic growth. Our position is strongly Protestant, and has not proved a failure. But many professors of the Protestant religion have failed to grasp its principles, and consistently practice them. The remedy is not in abandoning them, but in returning to them.

With our basis, we can be orthodox, and still be evangelical; we can be consistent advocates of principle, without being intolerant; we can be Lutherans, and distinct from all other Churches, and still can extend the hand of Christian fellowship to every brother in Christ; we can be churchly without being sectarian, and can be the more churchly because we are not sectarian; we make the true basis of the Church ours, and on this basis we are immovably fixed, but we can, at the same time, adopt all that is true and good in others; we can adopt the principles of the Reformers, and can adapt them to our age and necessities; and, in the nineteenth century, we can stand with Christ, and protest with the Reformers, without putting new wine into old bottles, and without sewing new cloth on old garments.

With principles that are peculiar, with a peculiar history, with a peculiar sphere of labor, our Church, and with it our Publication Society, has a special mission, which is co-extensive with these principles, and with this sphere. In opposition to Rationalistic and Pantheistic tendencies, we advocate genuine Christianity, and profess our faith in a God who, is both living and personal, who hears and answers prayer, who reconciles a world to Himself, through his Son, and who gives his children the inspiration of His Spirit. In opposition to an orthodoxy, which makes faith consist in an intellectual assent to dogmas, mathematically fixed, and frozen into a rigid mass, we advocate a faith, that lies back of head and heart and will, and controls all, making the man faithful; a faith, that apprehends Christ, and that has his life; that gives creeds their true value, by destroying their fictitious authority, and that prizes God's word too highly, to allow ages to heap rubbish on it, and thus destroy its purity and power. In opposition to the chronic tendency to make forms and cere-

monies valuable for their own sake, and thus give them undue prominence, we claim, that they are but the organ of the Spirit and the truth, and, that consequently, they are valuable only in so far as they convey Spirit and truth, without which, they are as cumbrous and lifeless as a dead body. In opposition to the prevailing tendency to legality and Pharisaic letter-worship, we advocate a spirituality which recognizes God as a Spirit, and worships Him in spirit and in truth. In opposition to sentimental cant on the union of all Christians, we claim, that the Church of Christ has always been one, and can never be otherwise; that consequently, there is already organic unity in the Church, as that of the branches in the vine, though this unity is not visible, but spiritual. To the superficial, sensational, spasmodic excitement in religion, we oppose the deep and lasting truth of God's word. We want the doctrine, that is God's doctrine, and the orthodoxy, that is synonymous with evangelical piety. We want life, but instead of animal, or artificial excitement, we want the genuine revival wrought by God's Spirit operating through God's word. What is doctrine for the head, must be emotion for the heart, must be impulse for the will, and must be our life. In a word, as the Church of the Reformation, we must apply the principles of the Reformation, and of Protestantism to the present. This means, that it is our mission to make central and primary, what Christ and his Apostles made such, and that all besides must be made secondary, or else must be rejected. And the centre of all is Christ himself—not his word, not his work—but Christ himself, who is more than these and includes them.

So powerful are our principles, that many who have gone out from us, pretending to repudiate them, in spite of themselves practice these principles. And, we cannot doubt, that these are the principles of the future. We must pass away; denominations and institutions may cease to exist; the name of our Church may become a matter of history, rather than a living reality; but the principles we have adopted, must finally prevail. Gradually the denominations will work up to them, and will recognize in them the truth of the Gospel. To expound these principles and to spread them, and to give the Church a literature in harmony with them, that is the special mission of the Lutheran Publication Society. As our principles and

our mission are peculiar, we should also have a literature that is peculiar, and is the outgrowth of these principles. This does not, however, prevent the publication of religious works of a general character, since, besides our peculiarities, we have so much in common with other Churches. But we need books that give an exposition of our basis; we want a review, a monthly, and weeklies in the English, German, and Scandinavian languages, which are true to these principles, which have character in them, and character back of them, and from which proceeds a virtue to those that come in contact with them, and which, while they breathe the spirit of love that was in Jesus, have also, his boldness and firmness. Either let us abandon our position, or else like true men defend it to the utmost.

"Be thou like the first apostles,  
Be thou like the heroic Paul;  
If a great thought seek expression,  
Speak it boldly, speak it all.

Face thine enemies, accusers,  
Scorn the prison, rack, and rod;  
And if thou hast truth to utter,  
Speak, and leave the rest to God."

Being called to a mission of such vast importance, the question naturally arises, what are our intellectual resources for the accomplishment of this mission?

In this country our Church occupies a vast mission field, and we, more than any other Church, ought to have a missionary spirit. The proportion of those that are nominally Lutherans, to the ministers in our Church, is larger than that of any other denomination. Under such circumstances it is natural, that our energies should be directed chiefly to the practical work. The constantly increasing, and daily ripening harvest, is greater than we can reap. But the time has come, when a church literature is an absolute necessity, a literature, that will not interfere with our missionary work, but will aid us in performing it. And though we have heretofore accomplished but little in this respect; though the draught on our practical energies has been such, as to leave but little time, and perhaps, less inclination for literary labors, still, I confidently assert, that we have resources for the development of a church literature, which are not surpassed by any Church. We have

at our command, untold literary treasures, which, however, like hoarded gold, are unused. We have not only intellect in our Church that might be made productive, and the usual resources of other Churches, but we have also, the vast treasures of German science and literature, as peculiarly ours, from which we can draw. Those who have investigated the matter know, that the literature of no other Church, is as rich as that of the Lutheran Church of Germany. It is a mine, in which all the denominations have quarried, and some have therefrom accumulated more wealth than our Church in this country. Let us frankly acknowledge it; we have impoverished ourselves by neglecting that mine. I met in German Universities, Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, and Episcopalians from this country, but not one who was connected with the General Synod of the Lutheran Church.

One reason why these treasures are not made more available to our Church is, that so many false notions respecting German theological science prevail. Many regard it with so much suspicion, that they never investigate it sufficiently to learn its real character. We are not to enter blindly the richest field of theological literature and appropriate the first works we stumble on, but we are to select carefully, and appropriate cautiously. Only such works ought to be translated, as are really valuable. Like real thinkers, we should master the material we select and assimilate it, working it into our system and life. Our principles give us the law for making our selections and appropriations. "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

Some are apprehensive that the introduction of German theology will, also, introduce German infidelity. With reference to some German works, this fear is but too just. But there are many valuable works, that appeared before the introduction of Rationalism into German theology, and in these are included all the Works of the Reformation, some of which are much needed in our day. And even while Rationalism and Pantheism flourished, some of the deepest and most spiritual works were written. There were always deeper natures, which could find peace only in the Gospel; and the prevailing infidelity impelled them to search deeper for the hidden things of God. For every crisis, God has his men; and in its darkest days, Germany

had some of the brightest lights, that have illumined this world. Then, we are passing through conflicts, similar to those waged in Germany. We must yet meet a foe who has already been vanquished there. History teaches us that Christianity passes through various conflicts, to the fulfillment of its mission. The nations in the van give weapons to those that follow them in the same warfare. In Germany, where the poison grew, the antidote is also found. And, as German scholars have already passed dangers that are yet before us, they have erected lighthouses, where others were shipwrecked, and, if we will, we may be warned, and may escape the danger. German infidelity, and its modifications in this country, can best be met by the weapons that vanquished it in the land of its birth. But how can we remove an error, unless we master it? And how can we wield the proper weapons against it, unless we make them ours?

Many are suspicious of Symbolism in German theology. But this suspicion is by no means as valid as some, who labor in the interest of extreme symbolical tendencies, have tried to prove. The books quoted in that interest, represent only a part of German theology, just as the German Symbolists here represent but a part of the Lutheran Church of Germany. I do not hesitate to say, that many of the best scholars, and most spiritual theologians and preachers of Germany, agree in principle with the General Synod. The same principles that we advocate, are also advocated by men like Ehrenfeuchter of Göttingen, Beck of Tübingen, Tholuck and Müller of Halle, Nitzsch, Tweeten and Dorner of Berlin, and many others, whose names and works are familiar to the American student. The Lutheran divines and professors, who co-operate with the Evangelical Alliance, are generally men of sterling piety and liberal Christian spirit. Whilst preparing this address, I received a religious journal published in Germany, which has a basis to which the General Synod can heartily subscribe. It contains the names of many eminent men in all parts of Germany, who assist the editor by their contributions, who agree with its spirit and principles, and who represent a very large part of the spiritual portion of the German Church. In its prospectus, is the following language: "The Holy Scripture is the foundation of faith, and the rule of life; Christianity and Christian culture are the pillars which support the temple

of genuine edification." With reference to its contents, it says: "Its contents are to consist of edifying articles with reference to the affairs of the Church, but without being confined to narrow-hearted confessional limitations,\* though based on a positive Christian stand-point."

German theology is especially rich in Biblical science and literature, and much of its Scriptural depth has not yet been fathomed by us. There are many departments of thought, which the American student seldom enters, with which the German scholars are quite familiar. By them, subjects are thoroughly handled, which English and American students but seldom discuss. Their life of calmness, retirement, and profound and unceasing study, with the best aids and the greatest incentives, enables them to produce works, which our practical and distracted life could not produce. While there is not a department of theology, in which we might not learn from German theologians, there are some on which their works are specially valuable, such as dogmatics, history of dogmas, Christian, or Biblical Ethics, Biblical Psychology, Church History, Commentaries, and, in fact, all that belongs to Biblical science; and much of the matter on these subjects in the English language, is but a translation of the German. The replies to Strauss, Renan and Schenkel, are of special value in our conflicts with infidelity.. And to learn how utterly unhistorical the arrogant claims of modern Symbolism are, one needs but read such works as Johansen on the subject, or the various articles in Herzog's Encyclopedia on the subject, especially that on "Symbolische Bücher." There is much depth in German works, which might be used with advantage against the prevailing superficiality, and which might be made a spiritual leaven for our Church. And the deepest and most spiritual German theology being with us in principle, is as diametrically opposed to scepticism as to dead orthodoxy. And, it is by no means, merely speculative and metaphysical, as some imagine, but is the basis of all practical activity, giving the impulses that produced such men as Spener, Francke, Harms and George Müller.

I have discussed the principles which make the mission to our Publication Society peculiar, and have also referred of our intellectual resources; I cannot now call special attention to the greatness of the field it occupies, and the

\* "Ohne eingerige Einhaltung confessioneller Schranken."

importance of the mission it is called on to perform among the many thousands of Lutherans in this country. And every year by natural increase, and by emigration the field is enlarged, the demands are increased, the work of the Society is made more urgent, and our responsibilities are made greater. We are in a country, in which all is growth, and its growth is only in the germ; we have a Church in which all is life and progress, and we are only in the spring. Our past and our present create and encourage hope, and are prophetic of a rich future. Shall this Society be true to its principles? Shall its work be commensurate with its mission? Shall the buried talents in our Church be unearthed and put to usury, and shall the resources, that are ours, be used to enrich our Church? Can we not wed the depth and solidity of the spiritual theology of Germany to American enterprize and energy? Have we not the eye to see the greatness of our mission, the heart to feel its pressing urgency, the will and the means to accomplish it? In passing through this our crisis, shall we be true and conquer, or shall we be false and suffer defeat? The answer must come from the Church, from the whole Church. And in giving the answer, we must rise far above all prejudice, to the dignity of our principles, and the grandeur of our mission; there must be no Gettysburg, no Wittenberg, no Selinsgrove in the answer, but only the spirit of our Master. And there is but one thing to be feared in an arduous work; not our foes, not the greatness of our mission, not our weakness, not our God, but only our own faithlessness. If we are true to ourselves, God's omnipotence is ours, in the performance of our duty, and in the accomplishment of our mission.

God may have made it our privilege and duty, with such principles and such resources, to introduce a creative, formative and organizing leaven, into the present chaotic mass of religious thoughts. He may have given it to us, to give new impulses and new directions to the spiritual life of the age. Still we are in the day of small things; but let no man despise the day on that account. The cause that has in it God's truth and purpose is a seed, in which He already sees the results of the future, and which He blesses accordingly. And as the living seed is ever producing fruit, which again becomes fruit-bearing seed; and as the press multiplies one copy into thousands and

millions; so may this Lutheran Publication Society be a power that grows and multiplies with the demands of the Church and the Age!

---

## ARTICLE IX.

### NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*Notes, Critical, Explanatory and Practical on the Book of Psalms.* By Albert Barnes. Vols. II. III. The first volume of this *Commentary* was issued last year; these volumes conclude the venerable author's labors, as an interpreter of the Scriptures. They form an appropriate close to his valuable and highly useful work in this department, embracing a period of more than forty years. The early hours of the morning were devoted to the preparation of these Notes, and patiently and faithfully did the author labor on, till at the evening-time of his life, and at the end of his task, he gratefully lays down his pen. On every page you notice the results of his patient research, his calm judgment, great learning, evangelical spirit, and deep piety. Barnes' Commentaries will live, long after his departure from the earth, to enlighten the ignorant, and direct the inquiring, to aid future generations in the study of God's Word.

*Foreign Missions: Their Relations and Claims.* By Rufus Anderson, D. D., LL. D. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. The Foreign Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, the author, is well qualified to discuss the subject. The work, consisting of fifteen lectures, is full of the most interesting matter, showing the extent of the field, the nature of the work, its progress and success, the hindrances at home and abroad, and the claims of missions upon the churches and upon young ministers of the Gospel. It is the most valuable manual on the various aspects of the missionary question, ever issued from the press.

*The Life and Epistles of St. Paul.* By Rev. W. J. Conybeare, and Rev. J. S. Howson. Two volumes in one. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. This work, one of the most valuable contributions to our Biblical literature, is so well known and so highly appreciated, that it seems superfluous to speak of its merits. The various editions, which are appearing, are a proof of its popularity and the favor with which it is regarded. The publishers tell us, that in the present volume the entire text and all the notes of the complete London edition together with the maps and illustrations are contained.

*Sermons.* By Charles Wadsworth, D. D., Minister of Calvary Church, San Francisco. New York and San Francisco: A. Roman & Co. The author of these discourses is well known as an attractive and eloquent preacher of the Gospel. The volume contains selections from his ordinary and miscellaneous preparations, all of a practical and deeply evangelical character, and presented in an interesting and instructive form, and with the author's characteristic earnestness and pathos.

*Evening by Evening*; or Readings at Eventide for the Family or the Closet. By C. H. Spurgeon. New York: Sheldon & Co. This volume is intended as an aid to religious meditation. The thoughts are generally pertinent, and often striking and impressive.

*Christ in Song*. Hymns of Immanuel: Selected from all Ages, with Notes. By Philip Schaff, D. D. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. This beautiful volume will be cordially welcomed by all who are interested in our hymnological literature. It is a magnificent work, an honor to the learned editor who has performed his part with so much skill and good taste, and a credit to the enterprising publisher who has presented it to the public in the best style of modern book-making. The collection which is as unique, as it is representative, embraces the choicest hymns on the Person and Work of our Lord, as the centre of our faith, from all ages, denominations and tongues, and is divided into two parts, the one, containing mainly those poems, that present the great objective facts in Christ's life (*Christus pro nobis*), the other, those that bring out more fully the subjective application of Christ's merits and our relation to Him (*Christus in nobis*). The critical and biographical notes accompanying the selections form an interesting feature in the work, and must prove of great value to the reader. We trust the volume will receive, as it so richly deserves, a wide circulation among Christians of every name. We find in the collection, "Happy Christmas comes once more," translated from the Danish, by Dr. C. P. Krauth, of Phil.

*Care Cast upon the Lord*. By Rev. J. Hall, D. D. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. This is a good little book, full of Christian comfort, designed especially for those, whose faith is feeble, and whose burdens are too heavy for them. The perusal of its kind exhortations, written in a simple and earnest style, cannot fail to make burdened hearts lighter and wearied lives brighter.

*Outlines of Old Testament History for Youth*. Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication. Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. Mr. Shryock has again shown his good judgment in giving to the Church this admirable volume, so well adapted to the instruction of the young, recently prepared by the Rev. G. F. Maclear of England. We greatly rejoice in the good work which our Board is accomplishing, and trust that there is a still more prosperous career before it.

*Plain Words*. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D. Philadelphia: Lutheran Book Store. This little volume contains Discourses on the "Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost," "The Glad Disciples," "The Burning Bush," and "The Lord's Supper," reprinted from the columns of the *Lutheran & Missionary*. Like all the productions of Dr. Seiss' pen, they indicate careful preparation, and are worthy of the high reputation which the author enjoys as a clear and vigorous writer, in this country and in England.

*Incidents of the U. S. Christian Commission*. By Rev. E. P. Smith, Secretary of the Field Commission. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. This volume contains facts and well-authenticated incidents, connected with the labors of the Christian Commission, selected from the reports of its delegates, and grouped together, as memorials of the War. The work is faithfully done, and no one can read the book without deep feeling, and with gratitude to God for the important service, rendered by this beneficent institution at a very critical period in the history of our country.

*The Christian Sabbath Vindicated, and the Sabbath in its Political*

*Aspect.* Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. The author of this volume is an intelligent layman, who has presented an interesting and attractive discussion of the subject, not in a didactic form, but designed more especially for the general reader.

*A Doctrinal and Ritualistic View of the Holy Eucharist.* By Hon. G. S. Lacy. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. This discussion is by a member of the Louisiana Bar, and is written in the interest of the High Church party in the Episcopal communion, taking the highest ground on the question of the Real Presence.

*Studies in Philosophy and Theology.* By Joseph Haven, D. D., Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary. Andover: W. F. Draper. These discussions will attract the attention of that growing class of readers, who are interested in questions of philosophical and theological science. The work is divided into two parts: I. Studies in Philosophy, including discussions on the Philosophy of Sir. William Hamilton, Mill *versus* Hamilton, The Moral Faculty, Province of Imagination in Sacred Oratory, The Ideal and the Actual. II. Studies in Theology, embracing discussions on Natural Theology, The Doctrine of the Trinity, Theology as a Science, its Dignity and Value, Place and Value of Miracles in the Christian System, Sin, as related to Human Nature and the Divine Mind, Arianism—the Natural Development of the Views held by the early Church Fathers. These topics are ably presented, not in the interests of any particular religious denomination, or form of faith; but the simple results of a Christian scholar's independent investigation of truth.

*An Alphabetical Index to the New Testament.* Common Version. Suitable to any edition, and useful to all ministers, teachers and Bible readers. By S. Austin Allibone, LL. D. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union. In Biblical literature a work, like the present, has long been a *desideratum*, and it is somewhat remarkable, that it has not, before this time, been supplied. But a portion of the needed work has now been accomplished in this valuable Index to the New Testament, and we trust its industrious and learned author will not be discouraged from undertaking a similar work on the Old Testament. It is unnecessary to add, that whatever Dr. Allibone attempts is well done, and that the present labor is worthy of his well-earned reputation.

*Recollections of a Busy Life.* By Horace Greeley. New York: J. B. Ford & Co. This is an elegant octavo, well printed and beautifully illustrated, containing a history of the author's early life, his education, apprenticeship, adventures, professional and political reminiscences, Congressional and editorial experience. It is an exceedingly interesting and instructive work, furnishing not only the personal history of a remarkable man, but the history of our country during an important period.

*Recollections of Men and Things at Washington,* during the Third of a Century. By L. A. Gobright. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. The author, during his long residence at Washington, in connection with the press as correspondent, reporter, or editor, had the most ample opportunities of observing men and things. The book begins with the exciting period connected with the United States Bank in 1834, and comes down to the present times. Many of the incidents and facts are here published for the first time.

*Thunder and Lightning.* By W. De Fonvielle. Translated from the French and edited by T. L. Phipson, Ph. D. F. C. S. Illustrated with thirty-nine engravings on Wood. *The Wonders of Optics.* By F. Marion. Translated from the French and edited by Charles W. Quinn. *The Phenomena and Laws of Heat.* By Prof. Achille Cazin. Translated and edited by Elisha Rich. Illustrated with seventy engravings on wood and a colored frontispiece. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. These are delightful volumes belonging to an extended series, designed to popularize science and art, which we are glad to see introduced into our country. The numerous illustrations, the pleasant style of the text and the large amount of instructive information here embodied, will render the series most acceptable to all classes of readers.

*The English of Shakespeare:* Illustrated in a Philological Commentary on his *Julius Caesar.* By George L. Craik, Professor of History and of English Literature in Queen's College, Belfast. Edited from the third revised London edition, by W. J. Rolfe, Master of the High School, Cambridge, Mass. Boston: Edward Ginn. This beautiful and convenient edition of Craik's English of Shakespeare, contains interesting Prolegomena, the Tragedy of *Julius Caesar,* and a valuable Philological Commentary, and is well adapted to awaken an interest, and to assist in the critical study of our vernacular. It may be used with advantage in our schools of a higher grade, and by all who desire a more philosophical acquaintance with our language and literature.

*Introduction to the Study of English Literature.* By Henry N. Day. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. The author thinks that the English language and literature must be studied in their growth, and by the thorough perusal of representative men, in the successive stages of growth. He, therefore, gives selections from distinguished writers, worthy of special study. These selections are accompanied with copious notes, philological, historical, and æsthetical, indicating and explaining the changes in the forms and meanings of the words, and the structure of the sentence, also, with a glossary, index and chronology of English Literature for systematic study.

*A Copious and Critical Latin-English Lexicon.* Founded on the German-Latin Dictionaries of Dr. William Freund. With a brief comparison and illustration of the most important Latin Synonyms, compiled and abridged chiefly from the works of Dusnesnil, Rams-horn, Döderlein and Hill. Also, English-Latin Dictionary altered from the English-Latin Dictionary of Dr. Kaltschmidt. By P. Bullions, D. D. New York: Sheldon & Co. Of the great value of Dr. Bullions' labors in the direction of classical learning we have several times spoken in the *Review.* He was an experienced and successful teacher, and we take pleasure in commending to favor the volume, before us.

*The Conscript:* A Story of the French War of 1813. By Erckmann—Chatrian. Translated from the French. New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. This story, told with quaint simplicity and truthfulness, contains the experience of a young French peasant, a conscript in the Napoleonic wars, including the most touching incidents and thrilling sketches of the fearful battles in which he participated, particularly those of Lützen and Leipzig.

*Waterloo:* a Sequel to the Conscript of 1813. Translated from

the French of Erckmann—Chatrian. With six full-page illustrations. New York : Charles Scribner & Co. The readers of the "Conscript" will receive with delight the continuation and conclusion of the charming story, and the desire will be increased for translations of similar works, written with so much skill.

*Tales from Alsace*, or Scenes and Portraits from Life in the days of the Reformation, as drawn from the Old Chronicles. Translated from the German. New York : Robert Carter & Bros. The volume embraces a series of narratives, designed to illustrate the times of the Reformation. They are life-like and attractive, and carry the mind with interest to that thrilling period in the history of the Church.

*Our Life in China*. By Helen S. C. Nevius. New York : Robert Carter & Bros. The writer of this volume with her husband, engaged in missionary labor, resided ten years in China, and, in an interesting and instructive narrative, here gives the result of her personal knowledge and experience.

*Margaret Russell's School*. New York : Robert Carter & Bros. This is a beautiful story with useful lessons, and is worthy of a place among the excellent books for the young, bearing the impress of the Messrs. Carter.

*Stella Ashton* : or Conquered Faults. By C. Y. Barlow. Philadelphia : J. C. Garrigues & Co. Mrs. Barlow is well known to many of our readers by her successful contributions to our Sunday School literature, and the publishers, by their seasonable publications, are placing the public under great obligations to them.

*American Edition* of Dr. Wm. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. Hurd & Houghton. This admirable work so indispensable to every minister's library, revised and edited by Prof. Hackett, and Rev. Ezra Abbot, has reached the eighteenth number, which concludes with *Moses*.

*Plymouth Pulpit* has reached No. 10 of volume II. Each number contains a recently preached Sermon of Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, and is the only authorized publication of his Sermons.

*Addresses* delivered at the Inauguration of Milton Valentine, D.D., as President of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg Pa., December 21st, 1868. Gettysburg : "Star and Sentinel."

*The Christian Sabbath*. A Sermon delivered by J. A. Brown, D. D., Professor of Didactic Theology in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, in Christ Church, Gettysburg, February 21st, 1869. Published by the Theological Students. Gettysburg : "Star and Sentinel."

*Luther's Translation of the Holy Scriptures* : The New Testament. By Charles P. Krauth, D. D., Norton Professor of Theology in the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, and Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in the University of Pennsylvania. Reprinted from the Mercersburg *Review* for April, 1869.

*Messrs. Tipton & Myers*, Photographers, of Gettysburg, have kindly placed on our table copies of their beautifully executed card Photographs of several of the Patriarchs of the Church, whose memory is so precious to us all. They are Drs. H. M. Muhlenberg, H. E. Muhlenberg, Helmuth, Schmidt, Goering and J. Geo. Schnucker. They are worthy of general circulation through the Church.

## CONTENTS OF NO. LXXIX.

Article.	Page
I. SACRAMENTAL PRESENCE,.....	317
By Rev. CYRUS THOMAS, De Soto, Ill.	
II. THE KEYS,.....	341
By Rev. G. H. N. PETERS, Springfield, Ohio.	
III. THE WILL,.....	363
By Rev. ALLEN TRAYER, A. M., Andover, N. Y.	
IV. REMINISCENCES OF LUTHERAN MINISTERS,.....	381
V. THE LORD'S SUPPER,.....	401
By Rev. J. B. GROSS, Easton, Pa.	
VI. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,.....	418
By Rev. E. J. WOLF, A. M., Baltimore, Md.	
VII. THE GERMAN COLONY AND LUTHERAN CHURCH IN MAINE,.....	440
By Rev. HENRY N. POHLMAN, D. D., Albany, N. Y.	
VIII. THE SPECIAL MISSION OF THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY,.....	462
By Rev. J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, A. M., Pittsburgh, Pa.	
IX. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,.....	474

The *Review* is constantly improving. We unhesitatingly recommend it, and would like to see every Lutheran minister become a subscriber to it. We think that Prof. Stoever displays both ability and tact, and that he is favored in his contributions.—*Lutheran and Visitor, Columbia, S. C.*

The variety of topics discussed in this number, renders the table of contents attractive.—*Lutheran Standard, Columbus, O.*

The *Evangelical Quarterly* opens with an article on Death and the Intermediate State by Prof. Ehrehart, which is quite elaborate and able.—*The Evangelist, New York.*

The *Evangelical Quarterly Review*, edited by Prof. M. L. Stoever, of Pennsylvania College, is promptly out for April with these solid and valuable contents: (1) Death and the Intermediate State, Prof. C. J. Ehrehart; (2) True Faith—its Nature and Efficacy, Rev. N. Van Alstine; (3) The meaning of the word Selah (suggests that it may be (a) a suggestion when to rest the voice; (b) when some specially important thought needs pause for reflection; (c) may be an exclamation of praise, equivalent to our Hallelujah; (4) The Good Angels, Prof. H. L. Baugher; (5) How Shall we Order our Worship? J. A. Seiss, D. D.; (6) Lutheranism before Luther, Rev. R. Weiser; (7) The Keys, Rev. G. H. N. Peters; (8) Sermonizing, Prof. H. Ziegler, D. D.; (9) Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit, Prof. V. L. Conrad; (10) Notices of New Publications. This *Quarterly* deserves a much wider circulation than it has ever achieved, and that outside of the Lutheran communion. It is excellently edited, and gives much matter of general interest to Christian scholars.—*The Congregationalist and Recorder, Boston.*

The *Evangelical Quarterly Review* for April has been received. It deals chiefly with theological and ecclesiastical topics, and discusses them with dignity and vigor. It is the special organ of the branch in the Lutheran Church in this country, known as evangelical, and represents a good degree of learning and culture. The present issue discusses: Death and the Intermediate State; True Faith—its Nature and Efficacy; Meaning of the word Selah; The Good Angels; How shall we Order our Worship? Lutheranism before Luther; The Keys; Sermonizing; Sprague's Annals; Notices of New Publications. Gettysburg, Pa.—*The Morning Star, Dover, N. H.*